



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

19980123 145

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-90-027

CONTENTS

22 May 1990

REPUBLIC PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum Reviewed [M. Shimanskiy; SOYUZ No 14, Apr 90]	1
Estonian Communist Party Program Published [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 29 Mar 90]	2
Estonian USSR Deputy on Presidency [I. Gryazin; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 14 Mar 90]	6
Estonian Defense League Plans Described [I. Lindsalu, L. Rannamets; MOLODEZH ESTONII, 5 Apr 90]	8
Estonian CPSU Loyalists Address Followers [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 6 Apr 90]	9
Estonian CPSU Loyalists Protest Decrees [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 6 Apr 90]	9
Latvian Runoff Election Results [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 3 Apr 90]	10
Latvia's Repeat Election Timetable [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	10
Presidential Council's Kauls Interviewed [A. Kauls; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 31 Mar 90]	11
Klaucens Views Latvian Party Split [E. Govorushko; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 14 Apr 90]	12
Aftermath of Latvian Congress Viewed [V. Proskura; RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, 17 April 90]	13
Riga Workers' Pro-Soviet Resolution [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	14
Riga Workers' Letter to Gorbachev [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	15
Committee To Defend USSR Citizens Urged [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	15
Draft Platform of Latvia's 'Soyuz' Deputies Group [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 18 Apr 90]	15
Latvian CP Delegate Election To CPSU Congress [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 19 Apr 90]	16
Latvian CP Terms Citizens' Committees 'Unconstitutional'	16
Founding Congress of Latvia's 'Soyuz' Deputies Group Held [G. Pommere; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 24 Apr 90]	17
Latvian Deputies' Letter to Gorbachev [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	18
Warning to Latvians on Draft Evasion [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	18
Anti-Soviet Latvian Women's Meeting Hit [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	18
Calls for Militia Aid to Lithuania Hit [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Apr 90]	19
Ukrainian CP Central Committee Plenum Reviewed [N. Baklanov; SOYUZ No 14, Apr 90]	19
Resignation of Chernigov Oblast First Secretary Examined [A. Karanda; SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 31 Mar 90]	20
Lvov City Soviet Elects Leadership [O. Telenchi; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 7 Apr 90]	24
Presidential Council Member Revenko Interviewed [H. Revenko; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 8 Apr 90]	25

NATIONALITY ISSUES

Belorussian Independence Date Rejected [V.I. Mikhasev, L.N. Volodkina; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 23 Mar 90]	28
Ukrainian Pogrom Rumors Answered	28
Ukrainian Writers' Union Secretary Responds [Yu. Mushketyk; LITERATURNAYA UKRAYINA No 6, 8 Feb 90]	28
Kiev Rukh Leader Responds [V. Yavorivskyy; LITERATURNAYA UKRAYINA No 6, 8 Feb 90]	29
New Political Organizations Formed in Lvov [S. Romanyuk; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 10 Apr 90]	30
Pro-Lithuania Rally in Ivano-Frankovsk [V. Shlyakhtych; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 3 Apr 90]	30
Deputies Hit for Participation in Rally [L. Yanyuk; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 4 Apr 90]	31
Reactions to Recent Student Strikes in Kiev [L. Kokhanets, O. Pokalchuk; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 28 Feb 90]	31
Report on Kiev Pro-Lithuanian Rally [M. Derimov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 3 Apr 90]	33
Ukrainian Youth Protest Military Service [B. Sinkevych; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 10 Apr 90]	35
Ukrainian Rayon Committee Participant in Language Society, 'Green World' [V.I. Drobotun; LITERATURNAYA UKRAYINA No 9, 1 Mar 90]	35
Ukrainian SSR: Removal of Oblast Leaders Demanded [N. Baras; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 8 Mar 90]	36
Ukrainian Language Instruction on TV [T.M. Khrushch; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 22 Mar 90]	37
Crimean Tatar Cultural Organization Formed [L. Ryabchikov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 8 Mar 90]	38

LAW AND ORDER

New Form of Procuracy Oversight Analyzed [V.I. Andreyev; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKONNOST No 1, Jan 90]	39
Chairman of USSR Lawyers' Union Details Activities [A.A. Trebkov; CHELOVEK I ZAKON No 2, Feb 90]	43
USSR Supreme Court Head on New Legislation [Ye.A. Smolentsev; CHELOVEK I ZAKON No 2, Feb 90]	47

MEDIA AND JOURNALISM

Ukrainian Writers Blast Repressive Republic Press [LITERATURNAYA UKRAYINA No 9, 1 Mar 90]	53
Burlatsky Profiled as Editor of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA [I. Podshivlov; MOSCOW NEWS No 16, 28 Apr-6 May 90]	55

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

Chernobyl Society Registered [RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 16 Feb 90]	57
Food Additives to Counteract Radiation [RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 16 Feb 90]	57
Concessions To Chernobyl Hunger Strikers [PRAVDA UKRAINY, 24 Feb 90]	57
Head of USSR Chernobyl Commission Interviewed [V.Kh. Doguzhiyev; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 6 Feb 90]	58

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ISSUES

Glasnost Still Lacking in Ukrainian Literature, History [I. Dzyuba; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 17, 18 Jan 90]	61
'April' Writers Group Reform Program Issued [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 10, 9 Mar 90]	65
RSFSR Writers Union Comments on 'April' Program [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 10, 9 March 90]	66
Writers Union Rejects Karpov Resignation Request [V. Malukhin; IZVESTIYA, 18 March 90]	67
Ryzhkov, Deputies Discuss Financial Problems in Culture [S. Karkhanin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 24 Mar 90]	69
Soviets, Americans Cooperate on Religious 'Fund' [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 11, 14 Mar 90]	70
Armenian Patriarch Lectures at Pedagogical Institute [D. Saakyan; KOMMUNIST, 1 Mar 90]	70
Council on Religion Created by USSR Academy of Sciences [Ya.N. Shchapov; NAUKA I RELIGIYA No 2, Feb 90]	71
Informal Orthodox Journal Published [VECHERNAYA MOSKVA, 12 Mar 90]	74
Orthodox Synod Deplores Loss of Cathedral [M. Filaret; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 13 Apr 90]	74
Head of the Lithuanian Orthodox Church Interviewed [Archbishop Khrizostom; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 6 Mar 90]	75
Minsk Believers, Cinematographers Vie for Building [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 10, 10 Mar 90]	77
Uniate, Orthodox Conflict in Ivano-Frankovsk Described [V. Kosarchuk; MOLOD UKRAYINY, 11 Feb 90]	77
Orthodox Hierarchs on Religious Conflict in Ukraine [V. Desyatnikov; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 15 Feb 90]	79
End of Industrial Development Demanded at Shevchenko Memorial in Kanev [LITERATURNAYA UKRAYINA No 10, 8 Mar 90]	81

Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum Reviewed

90UN1535A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 14, Apr 90 p 9

[Report by Mikhail Shimanskiy: "The Position. Notes from the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Minsk—The basic question for this plenum was the period in which to convene the Belorussian Communist Party congress, the accountability-and-election campaign, government standards, and procedure for the election of congress delegates. Let me say at once that it was a question of special importance since those attending the plenum have to reach a decision that would reflect to the greatest extent the interests of perestroika and the interests of the cohesion and strengthening of the party. There can be no delay here. So what positions were defined at the plenum? Which arguments prevailed?

Against the backdrop of the events shaking our country today Belorussia seems to be a relatively tranquil republic. But this is to a large extent an external calm. Social problems are worsening. In many regions of Belorussia a truly disastrous ecological situation has taken shape because of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station: of the total area of radioactive contamination in the European part of the USSR 70 percent lies on Belorussian territory. The republic leadership is being constantly subjected to the sharpest criticism, and not without justification, for tardiness in dealing with this terrible misfortune. The Belorussian Komsomol Central Committee Buro recently issued a statement that was received with great public interest. It said directly and plainly that the official structures are unable and unwilling to engage in dialogue with the people and the public organizations and movements.

In short, the sociopolitical situation in Belorussia is far from simple, and internal tensions are growing. And the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee plenum discussed a question that directly affects party perestroika. What would those present say about this vitally important problem of ours, and what position would they take?

In his report the first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Ye. Sokolov immediately clearly defined the most important question on the agenda, namely, the periods for the accountability reports and elections. When will they take place—before the 28th CPSU Congress or after? Those supporting the former put forward the following arguments. The 28th CPSU Congress should have a program, drawn up collectively by the union republic communist parties, for accelerating perestroika in the party. If an additional full-blown accountability-and-election campaign is conducted in the Belorussian Communist Party before the upcoming CPSU congress then after the congress it will

be possible immediately to focus on practical political and organizational activity to improve all aspects of the lives of people in Soviet Belorussia.

But supporters of the other approach also have many weighty arguments. First, the framework of any upcoming accountability-and-election campaign will be extremely limited with respect to time. And that may lead to a situation in which some meetings will take place hurriedly and in a pro forma manner. Second, if it is conducted before the 28th CPSU Congress an accountability-and-election campaign will be superimposed on the uncompleted work to form the corps of deputies for the rayons, cities and oblasts and for the republic Supreme Soviet. Third, the speaker said, we must all clearly define our positions with respect to paragraph 24 of the draft CPSU Rules, which states that the union republic communist parties are independent within the framework of the CPSU Program and Rules. Do we need our own program and our own rules? For it is a question of our future, of how we want to see life in the Belorussian Communist Party...

The report contained a whole range of different versions and those attending the plenum could choose any possibility. Sokolov assured them that as far as the Central Committee Buro was concerned it firmly supports the opinion of the majority of the positive. It favors the second option, that is, holding the Belorussian Communist Party congress after the CPSU Congress.

But then we have the firm opinion of the party committee secretary at the Grodnyy "Azot" Association, A. Yevstrat. He believes that both the republic communist party congress and the accountability-and-election campaign should be conducted before the 28th CPSU Congress. The reasons? Today, says Yevstrat, within the apparatus of the city committees [gorkoms] and oblast committees [obkoms] and of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee many workers still occupy the same posts as during the period of stagnation. And this is one of the reasons why over the past 5 years of perestroika there have been no significant changes.

In general this statement by the party committee secretary was as a voice of alarm from below, the voice of rank-and-file communists to which oh! we must listen. The leader of the communists at an industrial enterprise noted that the prestige of the party depends largely on how attractive the personality is of those political gigs who personify the party in the consciousness of the masses. Even before the all-union congress a principled assessment should be made of the work of each full-time party secretary.

The reader should not get the impression that all that happened at this plenum was dispute about when to convene the next Belorussian Communist Party congress. The essence of this acute and far from simple discussion undoubtedly determined the main issue: what do we mean by the concept "radical renewal of the CPSU"? First secretary of the Belorussian Communist

Party Mogilev Obkom V. Leonov said that in the party committees and organizations there is special concern about the erosion of ideological positions that is taking place in the draft platform and the Rules, and in a whose series of statements by party leaders. It is now essential to overcome this alienation in party and achieve the direct inclusion of rank-and-file communists in the work of the raykoms and gorkoms and their apparatuses.

The struggle for power. It is uncompromising; life confirms this. On what does the outcome of this struggle depend? This question permeated the course of the discussion. Those present at the plenum tried in every possible way to find an answer to it. What should first and foremost be done here? Here is the viewpoint of Belorussian Communist Party Minsk gorkom secretary M. Misuno. Within the party, he said, there is an obvious tendency toward destratification. The number of people leaving the CPSU is growing. It is not just one or two party organizations that support a "democratic platform." This sharply raises the question of the need for a basis for consolidation.

M. Misuno said with concern that the party committees at all levels are lagging behind the processes that are taking place. Their activity reminds us of the tardy reaction to demands from below. This thought was developed and deepened by the first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Berestovitskiy raykom N. Soldatov.

It seems to us at the local level that the decisions of the apparatus of both the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and of the CPSU Central Committee there is first undue haste and then unjustified slowness. For example, everyone remembers the haste in the two or three days of the discussion of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee platform for the elections. And the incomprehensible slowness of the CPSU Central Committee and the result tardiness in the publication of the draft CPSU Rules...

How did those attending the plenum relate to the "Democratic Platform"? The fact is that a conference of those who support that platform had just taken place in Minsk. Its organizers, Ye. Sokolov had noted in his report, are exaggerating the contradictions and disagreements and trying to create parallel party structures. And he went on to say that the "ultimate aims of the leaders of the 'Democratic Platform' are totally clear. It is obviously high time to find out who are real communists and who merely carry a party card that they obtained by chance."

Gomel party obkom secretary A. Machulenko disagreed with the administrative condemnation of supporters of the "Democratic Platform." It is clear, he said, that work on the principle "if it is not permitted it is forbidden" is far from the best method. With the Institute of Party History, the Higher Party School, and many scholars within the republic communist party it would be possible to organize in-depth theoretical work on this alternative

document. After all, it is a subject for discussion and for serious internal party dispute.

The issue of the People's Front of Belorussia was also dealt with at the plenum. It is not officially registered in the republic and this is the cause of many very different kinds of false rumors. We must define our attitude toward the People's Front of Belorussia and other public organizations, said N. Kuznetsov, party secretary at the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Institute of Party History. We cannot pretend that it does not exist.

These notes contain just a brief analysis of the problems discussed at the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee plenum. We can see that answers were found to by no means all the issues that are worrying communists in the republic. Properly speaking, no one really expected that it would because too many serious processes are taking place in the party and in our entire life, and unexpectedly sharp turns are being found on the road of perestroika. But the communists did express their viewpoints in the main question on the agenda.

With regard to the main question on the plenum agenda it was resolved that the accountability reports and elections to the party organizations in the republic will take place after the 28th CPSU Congress, and the Belorussian Communist Party congress will be convened in November of this year.

In this connection one person attending the plenum told me this: "As you see, Belorussians are engaging in perestroika without haste." What he had in mind was the periods for the republic party congress. Well, time will tell

Estonian Communist Party Program Published

90UN1544A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 29 Mar 90 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Program of the Estonian CP (Adopted at the 20th Estonian CP Congress, 25 March 1990)"]

[Text] Administrative socialism has arrived at a state of profound crisis everywhere. Ultracentralization and monopoly of power by one party have become the main hindrance to social progress and the processes of perestroika. This dictates the necessity for re-thinking in depth the initial positions of party activity and the principles and immediate goals, rejection of non-viable models for the present and future, and condemnation of Stalinism as a crime against humanity. Otherwise even the most democratically-inclined segment of the communists will have no real influence in political life.

The democratic purposes contained in the platform drawn up by the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Congress and the appearance of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU" testify to the realization by many communists of the necessity for radical changes in the

party, and genuine solution of the problems facing the party and society as a whole.

In Estonia the processes which have been taking place for decades have spawned dissatisfaction among the entire population of the republic. The burgeoning growth of democratization has aroused the Estonians' consciousness. At the same time the obvious mistakes made during this period in determining the tactics for interaction of all nationalities living in the republic have deepened the sense of foreboding and uncertainty among the populace.

As a part of the previous administrative-command system, the Estonian Communist Party bears responsibility for the crisis situation in the national economy and the ecology; for the abnormal ethnic relations; and also for the negative phenomena in the party itself. At the same time there have been and still are people in the party who have always sincerely desired to serve their nation and their Motherland. Both during the period of Stalinism and the stagnation period they have strived to act according to their conscience, proceeding from democratic principles. And this is the basis for the emergence of the Communist Party from the crisis.

The present Program is intended to unite all honest communists to support the stable development of Estonian society on the path to a democratic society, oriented on the individual, as we understand socialism. The Program is intended for a period which envisages Estonia emerging from the crisis. It has been compiled on the basis of the draft program documents of the Estonian Communist Party examined at Estonian CP conferences, and of amendments to these documents expressed in the course of pre-congress discussions, taking into consideration the materials published for the 28th CPSU Congress ("The CPSU Central Committee Platform" and "The Democratic Platform in the CPSU"). The Program must be the basis for drawing up the platform of the Estonian CP delegation for the 28th CPSU Congress.

1. A New Society Needs A Reformed Party

In the existing party-state system of the Soviet Union, the Estonian Communist Party in fact has had the rights of an oblast organization of the CPSU. A radical change of such a situation and the Communist Party's rejection of monopoly power would signify political self-determination for the Estonian Communist Party, and its transformation into an independent party which is a part of the political system of Estonia. The Estonian Communist Party will operate on the basis of its program and organizational principles, which are based on the common human values of Marxism and the new political thinking. We shall make its most important goal a higher quality of life under conditions of democratic socialism, which respects human dignity.

The party brings together those who think alike, who wish to responsibly and competently resolve the practical tasks of the Estonia of today and tomorrow. Among

the most important criteria of party membership are unity of words and deeds, selflessness and honesty, and purity of conscience.

Only by being independent can the Estonian Communist Party truly participate in the political life of Estonia, flexibly change its tactics, create coalitions, and compete with other parties and movements. To achieve its goals, the Estonian Communist Party is depending largely on the democratization of the Soviet Union, and realization of the ideal of a common European home. Therefore the Estonian Communist Party sees its allies in all democratic movements which are trying to achieve radical economic and political reforms in the USSR and the CPSU. The Estonian Communist Party is working out a resolution on the form of cooperation with the reformed communist parties of the union republics, and on principles of relations with the CPSU in consideration of their program documents and the program documents adopted by the 28th CPSU Congress.

The Estonian Communist Party is being formed on the basis of the voluntary personal decisions of today's members of the CPSU. The party is open to all citizens of Estonia [Estonozemelyets] who accept its program documents.

The structure of the Estonian Communist Party can be based on the appropriate decision by communists on a territorial or production basis. The paid staff must be small. The basis of the organizational structure is intra-party democracy which gives each party member the opportunity to genuinely influence its policy by means of free election of leading organs, subordination of leaders and preliminary discussion of important decisions by the communists. All party members must be guided by the decisions adopted by democratic means. At the same time, the possibility of defending one's peculiar opinion must be preserved.

2. Tasks for the Near Term and for the Future

The Estonian Communist Party rejects the practice of administrative socialism and utopian models of the future. The strategic goal of the party is the creation of a society in Estonia which will achieve a standard of living comparable with the developed countries of Europe; which is assured of international recognition of the rights of man and civil liberties; and in which political and national intolerance is excluded. The communists consider their top priority task the assurance of social rights and social guarantees for all social formations and for every individual.

Radical, democratic reforms must be carried out in order to bring society out of the crisis. These reforms must lay the basis for principally new production, distribution and social relationships, capable of providing the people freedom of action and social security. In the course of these reforms the Estonian Communist Party considers it its duty to defend the principle of combining economic

effectiveness and social justice. Political and legal guarantees must be established to ensure the continuity and the irreversibility of these positive reforms.

In order to carry out these reforms, a certain transitional period is required, in the course of which decisive decentralization of all spheres of life should be completed—in the economy, social life and politics—which excludes the emergence of a monopoly of power by any political movement. Such a path will also lead to the restoration of Estonian independence.

A real achievement of state independence is the difficult and contradictory process, for which a firm economic and social base must be created along with the legal foundation for them. The crisis of society can be overcome only after just resolution of the question on the state status of Estonia, the achievement of general security and civic peace, stability in international relations, and establishment of guarantees of consideration for the interests and rights of all population groups.

3. The Economy for Man

The Estonian Communist Party is aware of the fact that under the present conditions of profound economic crisis the traditional social-democratic ideals are incapable of providing society a way out of the situation that has come to pass. The present situation in the economy demands taking extraordinary measures. We believe that radical restructuring of the economic system is the only real way out of the economic crisis. It is impossible to redistribute and expend resources which do not exist. Free development of entrepreneurship, including private; a sharp reduction of the proportion of state property; decentralization, privatization of production and universal protection of all forms of property; and development of the finance and credit system, are the only possible means of achieving balance in the market.

The Estonian Communist Party acknowledges that for there to be a way out of the crisis, such an economic policy (comparable with Lenin's New Economic Policy) is inevitable. However, along with supporting these radical economic programs, the Estonian Communist Party believes it is its duty to actively fight for the rights of the workers. In the coming years the transition to a market economy will lead to growth in inequality of possessions. The Estonian Communist Party will strive to guarantee, even in crisis conditions, social support of persons whose standard of living falls below the minimum; and also to provide, with the help of enterprises and branches of the national economy, an opportunity for re-qualification and re-training of the people.

Only after overcoming the economic crisis and after accumulating the necessary resources can we switch to a system of social security which embraces all members of society.

Estonia's geopolitical situation should be used to build bridges between the East and the West. For a long time to come, our connection with the eastern market will

remain the decisive factor. Any policy which contradicts this will be ruinous. The present principle for the republic's economic independence should be synthesized with the principles of a free economic zone with respect to the turnover of goods, capital and temporary workforce. This presumes reliable means of protecting Estonia's economic interests.

Major changes in production relationships and in attitudes toward property in the rural area are an extremely important condition for emerging from the crisis. The land is the age-old property of the people of Estonia, and as a means of production it must belong to those who actually work it, on the basis of property rights. Production of foodstuffs for the citizens of Estonia and for export is assured by a number of legitimate forms of property and the forms of production based upon them: specialized village farmsteads, collective and state enterprises, and producer associations. They should be oriented toward satisfying the needs of both the domestic and external market, and on the basis of economic expediency. Legal guarantees are necessary for the protection of property.

Education must be among the most important factors in the formation and development of the individual and the entire sphere of production. The Estonian Communist Party will strive to achieve a free general education, guaranteed by the state; and will at the same time support the development of alternatives, to include paid education. The acquisition of further education must be tied-in with the joint investment of the pupils, the state, enterprises and church circles, to include offering loans on favorable terms to those who wish to continue their education.

The Estonian Communist Party is opposed to wasting minds and talent, and will strive to provide state subsidies for scientific, economic, sport and cultural contacts with other states; and to develop cooperative training and skill enhancement for specialists.

Estonia will emerge from the crisis when there is complete state independence; when reform of the political and economic system is accomplished; when self-regulation of basic economic relations begin to operate; when the level of production satisfies the minimum demands of the consumers; and when renewed mutual relations between Estonia and other present union republics and other states are developed on the basis of equality and mutual interest.

4. The Estonian Communist Party and the Republic's Political System

Achieving the strategic goals of the Estonian Communist Party will be assured by the realization of Estonian statehood, based on the free expression of the people's will, taking into consideration the processes taking place in the USSR, Europe and throughout the world. Estonia's attainment of true independence must take place by means of negotiations between Estonia, the USSR and other interested parties. In the course of the negotiations,

the interests of all parties must be considered, and the preservation and development of the necessary contacts must be assured. Relations between Estonia and the USSR based on principles of mutual advantage and neighborliness will provide not only genuine guarantees to the true sovereignty of Estonia, but also to Estonia's non-Estonian community. At the negotiations, the necessary economic and political preconditions will be established for deepening a sensible division of labor and future establishment of most-favored nation status; for joint action in the spheres of production and labor resources; and also for humanitarian contacts.

The Estonian Communist Party is prepared to take part in organizing these negotiations together with all the interested political forces in Estonia. The foundation of such negotiations must be the affirmation of equal civil rights for all citizens of Estonia along with assurance of the necessary political and economic guarantees of Estonian state independence. This, in turn will also create conditions for effectively overcoming the economic and social crisis.

After re-establishing itself as a subject of international law, Estonia must follow the path toward a nuclear-free Northern Europe and the Common European Home. Estonia's relations with other union republics and states can be based only on mutually-advantageous agreements. The Estonian people believe that participation in international organizations is inevitable, and Estonia will strive to join them as an equal member.

We see the Estonian political system of tomorrow as a multi-party parliamentary system. The Estonian Communist Party is prepared to take part in the leadership of society; and also, considering the will of the electors, to take the position of the loyal [konstruktivnyy] opposition or form a coalition with other parties if that does not entail revising the program positions of the Estonian Communist Party. The Estonian Communist Party is decisively opposed to those movements and parties which strive for total dictatorial power, with politics given priority over the economy.

In order to emerge from the crisis, the mechanism of popular democratic control must be combined with powerful executive authority. On this basis, the Estonian Communist Party supports direct election of the leaders of the executive authority—the president, the uyezd council of elders [stareyshin], and the city mayors [mehr]. It would be expedient to balance the executive power with a two-chamber parliament, one house of which would be established by direct elections, and the other—by delegating representatives from cities and rayon Soviets.

The Law on Citizenship, the adoption of which will establish equal political rights for persons in Estonia who are permanent residents at the time of its adoption, will guarantee social stability and consideration of the interests of all citizens of Estonia. After the adoption of the

Law on Citizenship, the Estonian Communist Party will support the removal of all voting qualifications.

The Estonian Communist Party is in favor of radical change of administrative and economic authorities. Carrying out tax and budget reforms, administrative changes and decentralization of political and economic life must transform the volosts, uyezds and cities into independent, integral associations, capable of independently determining their own economic, social and cultural life, and providing for the people's social security.

The Estonian Communist Party supports the creation and the activity of political associations which help overcome the crisis situation with complete empathy and responsibility, and which defend the interests of various social and national groups.

5. Nationality Policies—Realizing Common Human Values

The Estonian Communist Party proceeds from the premise that the economic and social success of today's Estonia is possible only through the common will and cooperation of all citizens of Estonia [Estonozemelyets].

The Estonian Communist Party's nationality policy is based on the fact that Estonia is the only place in the world where it is necessary to ensure the preservation of the Estonians as a nation, and to freely develop the Estonian language and culture. While respecting historical traditions, communists at the very same time are striving to establish through legislative procedure the creation of conditions which would guarantee other ethnic communities living in Estonia the protection of their civil rights, to include development of their language, culture and education, and preservation of their national originality. In the sphere of inter-ethnic relations, it is necessary to observe the Declaration on Human Rights and other internationally-recognized acts on the rights of man. Any advantages on the basis of nationality must be excluded. Along with the Law on Citizenship, the Estonian Communist Party is striving for the adoption of a Law on Observing the Rights of All National Groups who dwell here. We believe it is expedient to set up an appropriate structural subdivision either at the Supreme Soviet or in the Government.

The Estonian Communist Party condemns a forced re-immigration policy. A strict Law on Migration that takes into consideration the demographic situation in Estonia must be drawn up and put into effect. And there must be clear-cut rules for receiving citizenship, for people who come here later. At the very same time, representatives of all national groups who dwell in Estonia must be assured of free contact with their Motherland, with their near and dear ones, and with the representatives of their people outside Estonia.

Estonian Communist Party membership is incompatible with a disrespectful attitude toward representatives of other nationalities. The Estonian Communist Party stresses that the nation is an inalienable part of what is

common to all humanity, and that ethnic nihilism is in no way compatible with internationalism. The Estonian Communist Party speaks out decisively against arousing hostility among the nations. It is the duty of communists to struggle with nationalism and chauvinism, first of all among representatives of one's own nationality, and to avoid confrontations among the nationalities. An atmosphere of international understanding, loyalty and civic peace must be established in Estonia.

* * *

The 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress is examining the destalinization of society, and the establishment of a multi-party political system as a natural component part of the democratic development of society. A process of legal regulation of party activities has begun in Estonia. Under these conditions, a period has been declared which begins with the 20th Congress and ends with an organizational definition at the next congress in the Fall, at which time the regulations will be adopted and the leading organs of the party elected.

During the transition period, members of the republic party organization shall decide, at their individual pleasure, their membership in an independent Estonian Communist Party on the basis of the program on reorganization of the Communist Party of Estonia.

The party's activities during the transition period shall be based upon the existing organizational structure of the party.

The Estonian CP Central Committee elected at the 20th Estonian CP Congress shall convene the party congress.

Payment of Membership Dues and Use of the Party's Material Resources

During the transition period, Estonian Communist Party members shall pay their membership dues, amounting to no less than one percent of their basic monthly wages, on a monthly basis.

City and rayon party organizations shall independently organize their financial and economic activity, freely use the income portion of the party budget under the control of the appropriate auditing commissions, and shall have their own bank accounts. The Estonian CP Central Committee shall establish prior to 1 May 1990 the norms for deductions from city and rayon party organizations on the basis of joint agreements.

Estonian USSR Deputy on Presidency

90UN1388A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 14 Mar 90 pp 2-3

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Igor Gryazin conducted by A. Birov (ETA), press attache of the Estonian representation in Moscow: "Will the Presidency Be the Guarantor of a State Based on the Rule of Law?"]

[Text] Moscow—[Birov] The special Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies is examining the draft law on the establishment of the office of USSR president. Proceeding from M. Lauristin's speech at the last session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on this question and from the status of a sovereign and independent Estonia, to what extent does this draft law concern our republic or the state? And to what extent could presidential authority limit the sovereignty of the republics of the Union generally?

[Gryazin] We need to distinguish two aspects here: political and legal. From the political viewpoint the establishment of a presidency and the election of Gorbachev to this office would contribute to the status of a sovereign Estonia, as, equally, of the other union republics. After all, Gorbachev initiated perestroika and, despite all the difficulties, has precisely maintained course toward democratization. As a wise politician, he is currently a guarantor of the progress of perestroika in the country and an improvement in the international climate in the world. From this standpoint it would be ideal to establish the institution of a presidency for Gorbachev personally, then no one would be interested in his removal since no one could lay claim to this office. This is one aspect.

But from the legal viewpoint it should not be forgotten that Soviet power came to Estonia in 1940. As the Latin has it, "in corpore," that is, "entirely," and brought everything with it here: the army, the gulag, the collective farms, Stalin and everything connected with him. This incorporates also the entire Soviet system of political administration, to which the Estonian people had not the least connection. They did not participate in the formation of the authorities.

With the establishment of a presidency, however, and participating directly in the shaping of its status, deputies from Estonia begin to recognize, as it were, this authority and its legality on their territory. This point is very dangerous from legal standpoints. This is why the question of the participation of the majority of deputies from Estonia supporting the concept of independence is today highly problematical. Will not our vote here subsequently be the argument in accordance with which we became a part of the Union in March 1990? Which is in conflict with the opinion of the majority of inhabitants of Estonia. And we could under no circumstances allow such a legal error. And this is the difficulty and contradictory nature of our situation: while supporting Gorbachev politically, we cannot express this by way of a ballot until assurances have been given that this step would not be interpreted as entry into the Union. And the main problem now is finding a compromise in the surmounting of this difficult contradiction. And although I have for the past 2 weeks been dealing with this problem, it is as yet premature speaking of results.

[Birov] Will introduction of a presidency be a guarantor of the building of a state based on the rule of law?

[Gryazin] Not automatically. After all, Haitian dictator Duvalier and Washington were presidents, and we could today cite Jaruzelski. The spectrum of powers of a presidency is very wide and varied. I stress, therefore, that the mere institution of a presidency guarantees nothing. It has to correspond to certain conditions: first, the president himself, as a personality, must be disposed toward the idea of a state based on the rule of law. Gorbachev's devotion here is not in question. But this guarantee is unreliable, the more so in that he himself frequently commits legal errors. A qualitatively different guarantee is the creation of a clear-cut system of the distribution and separation of the system of power itself and also the distribution of functions and rights between the president and the people—in the sense of referenda, secret ballots and so forth. It is precisely this which would create such a guarantee.

[Birov] But why such haste in the introduction of presidential authority if there are as yet no mechanisms for controlling the system of power itself?

[Gryazin] It is this which is putting many people on their guard. Even given full political support for Gorbachev, this question is worrying not so much the Baltic as all other democratic forces in the Union. After all, although the appropriate counterbalances are set forth in the law, they are not maximally dependable. They have been "put together" in haste. And could prove insufficient. For this reason the mere fact of such haste places the idea of a state based on the rule of law in a certain amount of risk. Although there sometimes has to be a proportion of risk when one is in a hurry. We are now, probably, in a situation where it is necessary to step on the gas pedal in a car jumping a red light....

[Birov] But will not the introduction of a presidency in this case lead to the total usurpation of power and another cult of personality and a return to Stalinism?

[Gryazin] There is this risk, of course. Usurpation under the present system has always been possible, but has been manifested outside of legal forms. Stalin was not, after all, president. Brezhnev was called president only by flatterers from the West with an interest in Soviet "stagnation". So the mere fact of a presidency in the Union will not in itself lead to a cult or dictatorship. But such a danger should be reduced and limited. And I hope that this will be the case. An additional guarantor here is the personality of Gorbachev himself. After all, when he came to power in April 1985, he possessed such to no less an extent than, say, Louis XIV. Remember what the very term "gensec" meant at that time?! Had he been thinking only of his personal power, there would have been no need to have initiated perestroika. But I recognize that this argument is far from sufficient, and all mechanisms of the regulation of power must be elaborated without fail.

[Birov] Igor Nikolayevich, you are a people's deputy, member of the union Supreme Soviet and a number of its commissions, one of the most popular politicians of

Estonia and are well known in the country as a whole. Your speeches at the sessions and congresses are forcing millions of people to ponder and frequently radically change their political and philosophical views. In addition, you are a professor and the day you defended your thesis you became the youngest doctor of legal sciences in the country. Why do you not offer your candidacy for president of the USSR as an alternative?

[Gryazin] The reason is clear: it cannot be ruled out that we will altogether decline to vote on the issue of presidential authority, as I have already said. And this being the case, how could I put forward my candidacy for this office? And, as a whole, I simply have no really practicable alternative to M.S. Gorbachev. As a scholar and politician, I lack a specific program for this goal. I would rather offer myself not for the presidency but would request that I be taken on by the president as an expert on constitutional law and legal issues, that is, as Gorbachev's assistant.

[Birov] Well, what, then, about the office of president of a sovereign Estonia?

[Gryazin] This is a far more complicated issue. After all, I came to be a politician by the will of fate and conceived of no long-term future here. And in terms of a whole number of qualities I could not, as a man and personality, be president. I lack that self-denial which a leader must possess. I have always sought a compromise and frequently make certain concessions, which also, possibly, is not characteristic of a leader. For instance, I formerly proposed in connection with the problem of citizenship the "zero option," that is, establishing citizenship the day the law takes effect. Today more and more people and political movements are leaning toward this solution, but at that time I was roundly criticized for this.

It is my political fate, evidently, that I must in the future always be some kind of leader.

[Birov] You are a member of the board of the Estonian People's Front, representative of the "Baba Eesti" movement and USSR people's deputy. How do you combine these three statuses and whose interests is it necessary to express at the congress?

[Gryazin] On the one hand I am obliged and wish to pursue the line of the People's Front. On the other, "Baba Eesti" is more a compromise version compared with the People's Front in the long term, and here I agree with and express its more prudent liberal-democratic economic policy. And, what is most important, the overall program of "Baba Eesti" has a good chance of being the unifying link of the two main large-scale national communities of Estonia—Estonians and the Russian-speaking population. And the one not only does not impede the other here but complements it since our fundamental aims are common. And as a people's deputy of the USSR, I support Gorbachev's policy and at the same time, as a representative of the People's Front and "Baba Eesti," I look for and see in him a partner for

negotiations on the future of Estonia. And compromise will be necessary once again here. And it would be most pleasant for me to see Gorbachev and his "team" as a partner.

[Birov] And, finally, let us put aside for a moment the fact that you are a people's deputy of the USSR who supports Gorbachev's policy and highlight merely the fact that you are a deputy from Estonia.

[Gryazin] Yes, you have rightly noted that I have been speaking to a greater extent as a political observer here. My possibilities as a deputy from Estonia performing certain functions and expressing the interests of my electorate are confined to a clear political mandate. And instruction No 1 for me is the decision of deputies of all levels of 2 February this year concerning Estonian independence plus the wishes of my electorate. And they are really such that it is truly necessary to move toward the restoration of Estonia's state independence, most likely outside of the USSR. But this needs to be done such as to preserve all that is valuable that exists in relations between the USSR and Estonia currently. And such that there always be good-neighbor, friendly and warm mutual relations between the USSR and independent Estonia, an Estonia, furthermore, which on its territory takes account of all the political, economic and military interests of the USSR. All this can be resolved. Necessary merely are the political will, commonsense and human wisdom.

Estonian Defense League Plans Described

*90UN1522A Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII
in Russian 5 April 90 p 1*

[Article by I. Lindsalu and L. Rannamets, Estonian Telegraph Agency: "Estonian Defense Union Is Expanding"]

[Text] By the beginning of April, the Estonian Defense Union numbered 1,200-1,400 persons. A provisional administrative center was established, and a headquarters is functioning that consists of four departments. The regular uyezd [district], in which the Defense Union was set up, is Pyarnumaa, where about 10 detachments exist at the present time. The establishment of the first public order patrol of the Defense Union is expected in Virumaa at the end of this week.

Kalle Eller, the initiator of the restoration of the Estonian Defense Union, explains:

"Detachments of the Defense Union began to be formed approximately a year ago. This year, on 17 February, delegates of the again emerging Defense Union assembled from all corners of Estonia in Yarvakandi. We decided that the Estonian Defense Union should be revived. But in doing this, we understood that the legally applicable statute of the Defense Union, which was adopted in 1931, cannot serve as a basis in the current situation. Proceeding from it, the structure of the Defense Union is based on such institutions of legal state

authority as the government of the Estonian Republic and the chief of defense troops, which we do not have now. Therefore, we decided to suspend applicability of the statute and to adopt a provisional statute for the time being.

"In the current situation, the Defense Union can emerge only in the process of civic initiative, its structure should form itself from below upward, and the leadership organs should be elected in a democratic way. Subunits of the Defense Union are established according to parishes. The provisional statute of the Defense Union assumes the purpose of its activity to be, first of all, the formation of the readiness of citizens for defense and for instilling habits of defense of the homeland. And only afterwards—the defense of the inhabitants of Estonia and their property in collaboration with other organizations that are being created. And this means that it will also be necessary in the near future to form a special structure for the maintenance of public order on a voluntary basis. Such a mass organization as the Defense Union cannot put police functions in first place."

"Certainly, none of us would like to live in a state where a majority of the men serve in the police," K. Eller believes.

Tynu Saare, chairman of the Rapla uyezd council, explains:

"The feeling of defenselessness has intensified in the population, crime has increased, and the voluntary people's militia have lost their original luster. On the initiative of the NF [people's front] of the rayon, the idea emerged to establish its own security service. We began with the establishment of the "Tarapita" practical sport society, and we wanted to call the organization that is being developed the Union for the Maintenance of Public Order. But when we familiarized ourselves with the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers No 372 "Concerning Emergency Measures in the Fight Against Crime," we did not like the fact that they again want to initiate action from the top down and not the reverse. Therefore, we concentrated our attention on the Defense Union, which has rich traditions and which, in cooperation with the militia, should guarantee people's safety.

A provisional statute has been developed. A board of the Defense Union was organized at the uyezd level headed by Militia Captain Manivald Kazepylid. The first detachments were formed last summer in Kayu and Yuuru in order to prevent the pillaging of villages that were not inhabited during autumn field work. A dangerous criminal who escaped from the Khaapsalu prison was arrested in Kayu. Before the creation of the Defense Union, bands of young people committed robberies in the village of Alu. There, and also in Yuuru and Rapla, self-defense courses were organized whose participants were trained by Captain Kazepylid. Not long ago the Defense Union was also organized in Myaryamaa, and overall in the uyezd there are now more than 200 persons in it. We plan to cover the entire rayon, to set up

communications between detachments, and to organize a patrol service for the purpose of capturing casual criminals.

The forces of the militia are inadequate, and the wave of crime is overwhelming. I hope, with the help of the Defense Union and the entire public, that we will succeed in establishing order.

The aim of the provisional statute of the Rapla uyezd of the Estonian Defense Union has been submitted for approval to the government of the Estonian SSR.

Estonian CPSU Loyalists Address Followers

*90UN1522B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 1*

[Appeal to all members of the Estonian Communist Party who share the position of ideological and organizational ties with the CPSU signed by V. Malkovskiy, Yu. Tolmachev, A. Volkov, G. Smirnov, V. Boytsova, N. Zakharov, G. Rastegayev, V. Sobchak, A. Dragunov, A. Mamayev, and G. Renin]

[Text] Comrade Communists!

The processes of the qualitative renewal of our party are taking place painfully and ambiguously. It is extremely important under these conditions to preserve our ideological conviction, the integrity of party ranks, and a tolerant attitude toward those who do not share our opinions.

Proceeding from this, we, members of the coalition of the Estonian CP Central Committee, who were elected by a majority of the delegates of the Estonian CP 20th Congress, guided by the decisions of our own city and rayon conferences, will defend ideological and organizational unity with the CPSU. While recognizing the right of the Estonian people to self-determination, we will conduct a policy against the secession of the Estonian SSR from the structure of the Soviet Union in a unilateral procedure before an appropriate mechanism is developed.

We behave with understanding toward members of the party who have expressed a desire to secede from the CPSU framework, and at the same time we will try to see to it that the formation of an independent Communist Party of Estonia on a program adopted by the Estonian CP 20th Congress occurs on the basis of a valid voluntary expression of will, and without compulsion and the imposition of someone else's opinion.

We see our task as the preservation of the party structure, a staunch CPSU membership, the defense of the interests of communists and the party organizations that share the main positions of the drafts of the platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Congress and of the CPSU Statute on the republic level.

We think it necessary in the near future to switch from slogans about activity to real action in economic, social

and legal policy, and to develop appropriate short-term programs of action directed at the resolution of vitally important problems of all of the residents of the republic, regardless of their national origins.

We believe that one of the main tasks in the present period is the organization of genuinely democratic elections of delegates to the 28th Congress from party organizations of Kokhtla-Yarve, Narva, Sillamya, the Morskoy and Kalininskiy rayons of the city of Tallinn, and the Estonian maritime shipping line and production association "Estrybprom" [Estonian Fishing Industry] with a simultaneous development of the fundamental proposals in the platform and the CPSU Statute.

In the situation that has developed, when the same tasks confront the Estonian CP Central Committee, elected in part by the delegates of the Estonian CP 20th Congress, we are convinced that unity and the coordination of our actions are necessary to the attainment of our common objectives.

We see our participation in the work of the coalition of the Estonian CP Central Committee as an opportunity for a more complete preservation of our party ranks, and assurance of the cooperation of all party organizations and communists who defend the ideological and organizational unity of the CPSU.

Estonian CPSU Loyalists Protest Decrees

*90UN1522C Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 1*

[Declaration signed by V. Malkovskiy, A. Volkov, N. Zakharov, G. Smirnov, V. Boytsova, V. Sobchak, and G. Renin, members of the coalition of the Estonian CP Central Committee]

[Text] We, members of the coalition Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia, expressing and defending the interests of communists who are against the unilateral decision on the question of the secession of the Estonian SSR from the USSR structure before the elaboration of an appropriate mechanism, believe that the decree adopted at the first session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet "On the State Status of Estonia" and the Declaration "On the Cooperation of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Congress of Estonia" are juridically illegal, aggravate an already alarming situation in the republic, inspire even greater uncertainty among the non-Estonian part of the population for its fate, and compel it to take reciprocal steps against the decisions that were approved.

Under conditions of a constitutional conflict, we believe that the declaration of the communist deputies of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet on suspending the force of these decisions in their electoral districts is correct, and we support the decisions of the city soviets of Sillamya, Kokhtla-Yarve, and Narva on these questions.

For the purposes of averting the consequences of ill-considered and hasty decisions of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR, we appeal to the deputies with a proposal to refuse to adopt decisions that destabilize the situation in Estonia, and to concentrate their attention on questions of the economy and ecology, and on that which could unite the residents of the republic.

Latvian Runoff Election Results

90UN1508A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
3 Apr 90 p 1

[Report from Latvian SSR division of Soviet construction and trade union life: "Plus 14 People's Deputies"]

[Text] Another round of elections of Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputies has been completed. On 25 and 31 March and also on 1 April in the republic there was a runoff election which resulted in the appointment of 14 individuals with deputy mandates.

On 25 March the voters named the first two winners of the runoff election. They were: in the 122th Dobelskiy District—the chief of the Dobelskiy Rayon statistics division, R. Chernays and in the 164th Dritaenskiy District—an instructor at the Rezekne school of applied art, A. Seykst.

On 31 March, of the four candidates in the 108th Vilyakskiy and the 134th Ozolnietekskiy electoral districts, according to preliminary figures, the following won places in the parliament: the director of the interkolkhoz timber combine based on the Berzkalne kolkhoz [collective farm], K. Shlyakota, and the chairman of the Stalgene agricultural firm, M. Arnitis.

Well, of course, the public was waiting impatiently for 1 April. For the fate of dozens of deputy mandates was to be decided on that day—and nine of them were in electoral districts of Riga.

Here are the preliminary results.

In the 150th Zilupskiy district the individual elected as republic people's deputy was the first secretary of the Ludzenskiy party raykom, F. Stroganov.

In the 15th Riga electoral district the winner was the general director of the Pardaugava scientific agro-industrial firm, A. Zhuk.

In the 22d Riga district—a lawyer for cooperative legal consultation, G. Morozli.

In the 29th Riga district—a docent of the Riga institute of civil aviation engineers, O. Shchiptsov.

In the 41th Riga district—a police division chief of the Plyavniyeki internal affairs division of the Moskovskiy Rayon executive committee, P. Shapovalov.

In the 42d Riga district—a sector chief of the Riga party city committees, V. Mikhaulov.

In the 43d Riga district the voters gave their preference to the head economist at Riga Heat and Power Plant, O. Blumbergu, and in the 46th—a docent in the law school of Leningrad State University, I. Brinke.

In the 47th Riga district the deputy mandate was won by an engineer-designer of the Impuls special design bureau of the Kommutor Production Association, A. Safonov.

In the 50th Riga district—the deputy general director of the Latrybprom Production Association, N. Buylov.

The editors of SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA thank their readers and all voters who understood the newspapers advice and recommendations and voted for the candidates who are guided by the realities of our restless time and who envisage Latvia on the socialist path of development.

And so the runoff vote has ended. But we have before us a no less important measure—runoff elections in 17 districts. They will be held on 29 April.

Latvia's Repeat Election Timetable

90UN1508B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 April 90 p 3

[Report from division of Soviet construction and trade union life: "The Elections Have Ended, The Elections Are Continuing, We Are Preparing for 29 April"]

[Text] The election campaign for elections of Latvian SSR people's deputies has reached the finish line: On 29 April there will be repeat elections which should result in filling the 17 remaining vacant positions in the republic parliament.

Let us remind the readers why the election precincts will be waiting for the citizens again.

It says in article 55 of the Law on Elections: "Repeat elections are held: If the elections for the electoral district are declared to be nullified or invalid; if no more than two candidates have and none has been elected; if no-one has won in the runoff election."

The first and third factors, as they say, passed us by. But the second stood out clearly as soon as the results of the elections held on 18 March were totaled.

In 16 districts of the republic where two candidates ran for each mandate the voters did not show a preference for either one and essentially they "voted down" both.

Let us list these districts: 9, 14, 17, 19, 32, 39, 60, and 65 (all in Riga), 73 and 75—Daugavpils, 99—Rezekne, 127 and 129—Yekabpils, 132—Eleysk, 171—Olayne, and 192—Smiltene. Added to the above is 44 in Riga. We have already reported to the readers about the situation there. (SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 20 March 1990).

Well, since we have elections, all the procedures related to them are also repeated. This is how this looks in terms of dates determined by the republic Central Election Commission.

Nomination of candidates—up to 12 April, inclusive. Registration—up to 15 April. The final results of registration should be reported in the mass media no later than the third day after registration.

Preliminary campaigning for candidate deputies is done from the day of registration until 28 April.

After 2 April—submission of voter lists for general familiarization.

The election commissions should do all the work for organizing the forthcoming voting from 0700 to 2000 hours local time.

Reports from the district election commissions on the results of the voting will be made public no later than 3 May.

And another reminder of no small importance. City (cities under republic jurisdiction) and rayon soviets of people's deputies or their presidiums, according to the decree of the Latvian SSR Central Election Commission, had to decide before 31 March the question of the composition of the corresponding precinct election commissions: to leave them as they were or to establish new ones.

This is how full the final stage of the election of the republic parliament is.

Compressed time periods. There is no time to waste. Therefore the labor collectives and organizers of meetings in the places of residence of the voters—with the active participation of communists—should approach the nomination of candidate deputies in a thoughtful and balanced way. They should be energetic, knowledgeable comrades who have a clearcut program for improving our life, hold democratic, internationalist positions, and are confirmed opponents of any separatist tendencies—whether this pertains to the future of the republic or the fate of the Communist Party of Latvia.

And it is understandable: The opinion of any of the 17 deputies whom we are to elect on 29 April, with the alignment of political forces that develops in the republic parliament, can be decisive in adopting one law or another (let us recall the situation in the Riga city soviet). This is why we must approach the nomination of candidates quite seriously. We must not make mistakes here.

Presidential Council's Kauls Interviewed

90UN1543A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
31 Mar 90 p 2

[Interview with Albert Kauls, member of the Presidential Council, conducted by LATINFORM correspondent V. Semenov: "In the Name of Perestroyka, for the Good of Latvia!"]

[Text] [Correspondent] I congratulate you, Albert Ernestovich, on your election to such a high office. But tell me frankly: had you anticipated this, had you struggled for the title of presidential adviser?

[Kauls] I had no prior conversation on this subject with M. Gorbachev. And, availing myself of the situation, I would emphasize once again that I am not interested in a career in the generally accepted meaning of this word. I can confirm this if only by the fact that last summer I requested some land in Tsesisskiy Rayon and acquired it freehold.

The offer from M. Gorbachev was a surprise. Literally a few days prior to the publication of the edict on my appointment to the Presidential Council, I was invited to an interview in the Kremlin and I was there offered this honorary and extremely responsible office. I said in the Presidential Council, incidentally, that I had become a freeholder and that I had taken on a new burden. I spoke about the plans to be implemented by the "Adazhi" agro-company and also the activity of the Latvian Agriculturalists Union. Mikhail Sergeyevich assured me that my duties as member of the Presidential Council would not, although not affording me any extra free time, prevent me performing the work I had begun.

[Correspondent] What do you think, on what did the president base his choice?

[Kauls] There is no looking into another's heart, even if he is of like mind. But at that interview with the proposed members of the Presidential Council Mikhail Sergeyevich said that his main criterion when determining upon the Presidential Council was finding and selecting people confident in the perestroyka that had begun and ready to go together with him as far as its realization in full.

[Correspondent] Of what will your work in your new field of activity consist?

[Kauls] I have to confess that there is still much that is unclear and uncertain here. Just one thing is clear: I will be dealing with questions of the country's agro-industrial complex. And the primary concern is finding as quickly as possible, today, a solution of the problem of providing our country's population with food. It will be necessary simultaneously to think about imparting stability to the development of agriculture for, as world experience testifies, only a stable agriculture can ensure a state's sovereignty and civilized development.

[Correspondent] Let us attempt to look into the heart of the president, nonetheless. On what was his choice based, what do you think?

[Kauls] My promotion to this office was connected, most likely, with the work I had done in the "Adazhi" agro-company. Several years ago M. Gorbachev paid a visit to us and saw how we worked, how we lived, how we taught and raised our children. And now also he most likely has information about what is being done by our outfit in

both the production and social spheres. He is aware, I believe, of our authority among agriculturalists.

I believe also that the president's choice was connected with the progressive processes in the political and economic life of Latvia and, to some extent, of the whole of the Baltic also.

[Correspondent] Incidentally, does work in the Presidential Council distract you, Albert Ernestovich, from urgent concerns of the republic, your agro-company and your private farm?

[Kauls] While having agreed to this office, I remain devoted to my Latvia and the small particle thereof of "Adazhi" and I believe that I will be able to combine the obligations entrusted to me by fate, honor and duty with my new office.

[Correspondent] What would you like to tell the people of Latvia from the height of your new position?

[Kauls] I call on all inhabitants of Latvia to be more prudent in today's conduct and in subsequent action and to be more restrained, thoughtful and purposive. We should not attempt in the matter of a single hour to leap to a goal whose achievement requires a considerable amount of time. I call on the inhabitants of the republic to understand that agriculture is of particular significance in society and that, without having realized its special significance, we will not achieve the goals which we associate with Latvia's freedom and independence.

[Correspondent] Do you consider the restoration of Latvian statehood an end in itself?

[Kauls] I am convinced that this is not an absurd notion. But its realization needs to be approached thoughtfully, without haste and commotion. The achievement of this goal is associated with the solution of certain management and economic and also political and social problems. And for this reason it is necessary to build bridges in economic and political life both with the West and with the East. It is not a question of severing ties which have taken shape over the years, it is necessary to strengthen them. We need to do everything to ensure that the achievement of independence be associated with a strengthening of Latvia and the increased well-being of its inhabitants, but not at all costs—the reverse. We need to do everything to ensure that all the best that we have acquired in preceding years be perfected. Our future cannot be based on ruins, on the denial and destruction of all that has been done. I call on people not to look for enemies. We must all together shape a common goal for work and life. We need here to be vigilant and to try and distinguish wheat from chaff, the reckless from those who are doing useful work.

Let us create an atmosphere of amicability, mutual respect and cordiality among the indigenous population of Latvia and all its inhabitants. While going about our quotidian business and thinking about our future, let us try always to remember that the basis of all achievements

and all problems is the land and labor. For only the land and selfless labor will afford us an opportunity to realize the set goals.

Klaucens Views Latvian Party Split

90UN1521A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 14 Apr 90 p 8

[Article by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA staff correspondent in Riga E. Govorushko: "They Came in Order to Leave Spectacularly"]

[Text] We already know about the split which occurred at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Latvia from daily newspapers. I understand the sincere desire of many people to describe the situation as delineation. However, I believe that all hopes for mutual understanding, even those of the most sincere optimists, are going to be dashed as soon as today, on the day the constituent congress of the independent Communist Party of Latvia opens. We should say that its ideologists do not rule out a new name for this party.

First Secretary of the Riga City Committee of the party A. Klaucens comments on the situation:

"What had to happen, what the initiators of this split strove for in the first place, having set ahead of time the date of their constituent congress, has indeed happened. Approximately one-third of the delegates left our congress; this means that one-third of the communists may remain beyond the ranks of the CPSU. We should say that quite a few of them have not ultimately determined their position. It is for their sake that we need to continue work on finding a compromise. This is why our congress did not complete its proceedings but merely suspended them.

"The leaders of the 'independents' did not even conceal the fact that they do not intend to glue together the 'vase' which has cracked. Why did they and the like-minded people come to the congress? In order to leave in a spectacular manner?"

I believe that both the lack of political culture and the rigid uncompromising attitude of the majority at the congress brought about this. Among others, this is how another recent interlocutor of mine, First Secretary of the Balvskiy Rayon Committee of the party V. Varnas described the situation:

"I did not manage to keep a promise given to the communists of the rayon: to prevent a split, to adopt documents on the independence of the Communist Party of Latvia which makes general human values its priority. What has happened is the result of our coming to the congress without adequate preparation. The split is dangerous in that it sets the communists of urban and rural areas against each other."

I will add that Vitautas Varnas himself and other members of the Balva delegation have not joined either the

majority or the minority for now: They have gone back to the rayon in order to consult all communists. The congress has formed a conciliation commission and resolved to reserve some of the seats on the Central Committee in order to fill them at the final stage of proceedings.

One more commentary is that of congress delegate Artur Nevitskiy:

"The split has definitely brought about weakening the Communist Party in the environment of multi-party struggle. Yet, on the other hand, everyone was tired of the indefinite position of the previous Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee in the face of a complicated political situation in the republic. To a degree, consolidation of a majority of communists of the republic has occurred on a firm ideological foundation.

"The future of the so-called independent communist party of Latvia appears difficult to me. I think that the People's Front or the parties belonging to it will partially absorb it—after all, ideological differences between them have been actually obliterated for a long time. Another segment will go to the now forming peasant party. Only some of the party functionaries and urban intellectuals will remain in the independent party. However, let us not guess..."

Aftermath of Latvian Congress Viewed

90UN1521B Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 17 Apr 90 p 2

[Article by *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA* staff correspondent in Riga V. Proskura: "A Choice After a Choice"]

[Text] So, the split in the Latvian republic party organization has been made, so to say, official. The first congress of the NKPL [Independent Communist Party of Latvia] which proclaimed the creation of the "independent communist party of Latvia" has been held in Riga, in the university auditorium.

The assembly of party separatists did not last long; one pre-Easter "business day" was enough. Presumably, live radio and TV coverage prompted some of the participants in the constituent assembly of "the parliamentary party of a new type" to be more Catholic than the Pope, all the more so because invited representative of the motley "non-party public" were present at the congress.

However, quite a few of the speakers could not abide the spirit of Easter piety. One of the speakers got sarcastic and addressed the absent First Secretary of the Latvian CP Central Committee as "Mr. Rubiks" which, incidentally, drew applause from the audience. As all of them understood, this was not just a provocative polemical attack. It was rather a hint, a reminder... Not so long ago, the current leader of the republic party organization A. Rubiks, at the time still chairman of the Riga City Executive Committee, appealed to the "pre-congress" of the Latvian CP Central Committee Buro in a letter

published in the party press. In this letter, Alfreds Petrovich cautioned the political leadership of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] against complacency, "apparatus intrigues," attempts "to play both sides of the issue," and straddling the fence in public life.

Specifically, he stressed that "the gentlemen" (this is how the functionaries of the People's Front of Latvia, many of whom are Communist Party of Latvia members, address each other) are dying to grab power while hiding behind demagogic, populist slogans. This caused a stormy discussion in the republic. Hundreds of workers' collectives and primary party organizations adopted resolutions expressing support for the position of A. Rubiks and giving "a vote of no confidence" to a number of members of the Buro and secretaries of the Central Committee at the time. In a word, they paid back Comrade Rubiks in kind this time around.

I also mention this because the then Secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia for ideology I. Kezbers was elected chairman of the "independent party" at its constituent congress (his opportunistic behavior drew the most criticism from the labor collectives and party organizations of the largest industrial cities of the republic). To be sure, he was elected hastily, virtually without discussion, by an open vote, without alternative candidates. Chairman of the congress of the Independent Communist Party of Latvia A. Cepanis, the leader of the preparatory organizational committee on whose signal one-third of the delegates of the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Latvia left the auditorium, withdrew ahead of time on account of his future preoccupation with parliamentary affairs. Those of the local observers who mention the intolerably low "popularity rating" of Cepanis even in the separatist circles may also be right.

One day before the constituent congress of "the independent party," the first, organizational plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the republic elected by Communist Party of Latvia 25th Congress was held. On the eve of the plenum, documents of the forum of the Latvian SSR communists were released, including its decision to find the operation of the previous composition of the Central Committee unsatisfactory.

Local commentators noted that not one of "pre-congress" secretaries turned out to be among the members of the newly elected Latvian CP Central Committee. Several days ago, the republic newspaper *SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH* carried a statement by a group of "apparatchiks" to the effect that they will also proceed to "the independent party." Along with the cadre issues, the organizational plenum of the Latvian CP Central Committee also discussed the issue of operations of the party mass media in order to "develop a program of measures aimed at resuming the ideological activities of the party."

This very sphere of issues was of particular concern to the participants in the NKPL constituent congress. A majority of the "independents" rejected a proposal of the editorial commission to add the words "Latvian Social Democrats" "after a hyphen" to the name of their party. Many speakers explained the infeasibility of such a "stylistic" correction at present quite frankly. Their apprehension was that, in the event it was adopted, the separatists would not be able to claim even a segment of party assets, primarily the newspaper and magazine publishing house and the printing facilities of the Press House.

Well, there indeed is a issue. Incidentally, I will note that not so long ago a plenum of the Riga Latvian CP City Committee was forced to adopt a special resolution with an appeal to protect the member of its buro A. Rubiks against the moral-political pressure brought to bear by a number of the local mass media which was organized on the instructions of national-careerists.

I would not venture an assessment of the overall validity of the decisions of the NKPL constituent congress. However, it is difficult to disagree with the commentators who question them. Judge for yourselves. As was announced, about 590 representatives of approximately 30,000 people who had registered as "communists independent of the CPSU" (that is to say, out of 176,000 members of the Latvian Communist Party) took part in the work of the dissenter congress. It is also known that slightly more than 200 delegates had left the 25th Latvian CP Congress. Where did that many "plenipotentiary representatives" come from? It turns out that many of them were elected "spontaneously" by the splinter groupings and groups of party members.

Virtually not a single presentation by communists from factory and plant collectives was made at the congress of the "independent" Latvian Communist Party. Office holders and "faculty and instructor cadres" dominated there... Pardon me, but what kind of a workers' party is this?! Even if it is a "menshevik" [minority faction] one, as the participants in the congress called themselves.

To be sure, inter-party discussions and public disputes are in store which will determine the true place of the "mensheviks" in the socio-political structure of the republic. However, they have already made their choice—the dissenters have placed themselves outside the Communist Party of Latvia.

Riga Workers' Pro-Soviet Resolution

90UN1513A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Apr 90 p 3

[Resolution of city-wide mass meeting of Riga working people: "We Defend Soviet Power!"]

[Text] Citizens of Riga!

Working People of Soviet Latvia!

The situation in our republic is growing increasingly alarming by the day. In the wake of Lithuania and Estonia, forces bent on replacing the existing state system are increasingly making a grab for power. The so-called citizens' committees—the same structures which, as the ideologues of the Latvian People's Front and the Latvian National Independence Movement intend, are to replace Soviet power—have asserted themselves and are preparing for their congress. Appeals for a change in the constitutional system and propaganda of antisocialist and antiparty views are dominating television and radio programs and the majority of newspapers and journals.

We have for a long time been warning the party Central Committee of the impending danger and demanding the adoption of measures to protect and preserve the Soviet system. But the resolutions of our numerous meetings and the decisions of assemblies have been ignored and have not been supported.

Today, when the republic is on the verge of political and social catastrophe, our patience has run out. We declare that we no longer believe the bankrupt party Central Committee Buro, which has failed to lead a struggle for the votes of the electorate and has thereby handed power in the soviets to the Latvian People's Front, and we have no faith in the government, which is being formed to the dictation of the People's Front and demand:

1. The immediate abolition of the so-called citizens' committees recognized by the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium as unconstitutional.
2. Resumption on the Latvian television channel of the "Vremya" news program relay.
3. The allocation in Latvian television of no less than one-third of news broadcasting time for broadcasts in Russian on the life and problems of the republic.
4. The allocation in Latvian television of time for a program broadcast in Lettish and Russian of the republic's United Council of Labor Collectives.
5. The immediate suspension of the publication in the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Publishing House of the ATMODA newsheet and other anti-Soviet publications calling for the replacement of the existing state system.
6. That the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] prosecutor and USSR prosecutor general examine the question of the institution of criminal proceedings against Ya. Barkans, E. Veydeman, Ya. Lei and A. Tsurulis for propaganda in the mass media which they head of hatred of their fellow citizens, calls for a limitation of the rights of Latvian working people on a national basis and the spread of ideas of hostility toward and derision in respect of citizens of a different nationality and toward the Soviet Army and the law enforcement authorities and for a change in the existing state system.

In making these demands we no longer intend putting up with a situation where the voice of the working people is ignored.

We declare that unless our demands are met prior to 15 April of this year, the city's working people will reserve the right to avail themselves of any means of pressure available to them.

We defend Soviet power!

We will not allow in Latvia the "Lithuanian option"!

Adopted on 29 March 1990.

Riga Workers' Letter to Gorbachev

90UN1513B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Apr 90 p 3

[Letter from Riga Workers to Gorbachev]

[Text] USSR President M. Gorbachev

M. Burokyavichyus, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee (on the CPSU Platform)

We participants in the "For a Soviet Latvia in a Renewed Federation" mass meeting support the activity of the USSR president aimed against the disintegration of the state and at ensuring the legal protection of the individual and citizen.

We perceive with a profound feeling of satisfaction the actions of the USSR president pertaining to a normalization of the situation and the defense of the rights of all citizens of Lithuania and share the anger of various strata of the population of this republic at the adoption of a number of unlawful enactments by the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet infringing the working people's legitimate interests.

We express solidarity with the communists of Lithuania adhering to the CPSU Platform and support the formation of the Committee To Defend the Rights of USSR Citizens in Lithuania.

Adopted at a 100,000-strong mass meeting of Riga's working people on 29 March 1990.

Committee To Defend USSR Citizens Urged

90UN1513C Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Apr 90 p 3

[Resolution of city-wide mass meeting of working people of Riga: "Let Us Defend Our Rights!"]

[Text] The republic Supreme Soviet and the government have enacted and continue to draw up legislative instruments infringing citizens' constitutional rights:

—to elect and be elected;

—to obtain work in accordance with their vocational training;

—to choose their place of residence even within the republic;

—to obtain higher education in their native language.

The honor of people is insulted and their dignity demeaned daily on the television screens and in newspapers and journals for their different nationality, for other political views and for the fact that they were not born in Latvia.

The laws are inoperative, the prosecutors are silent. And this is forcing us into the following forced step:

—the creation of a Committee for the Defense of the Rights of Citizens of the USSR in Latvia.

We instruct the republic United Council of Labor Collectives to draw up prior to May Day 1990 the necessary documents for this and delegate to it the right prior to the formation of the committee to address state and also other organizations of the USSR and make each instance of a violation of our rights the property of the world community, using for this the platform of the upcoming forum in Helsinki also.

Adopted on 29 March 1990.

Draft Platform of Latvia's 'Soyuz' Deputies Group

90UN1788A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
18 Apr 90 p 3

[Unattributed article: "Draft Platform of Latvia's 'Soyuz' Deputies Group"]

[Text] The perestroika of the economic and political bases of Soviet society is accompanied by a destabilization of the state structures. This was taken advantage of by nationalistic and separatist forces which were able to disorient a part of the population that does not have political experience and that has lost confidence in the traditional forms of authority.

The People's Front of Latvia [NFL], established with the direct participation of the republic party-state leadership and ably utilizing the revival of national consciousness, took control of the legislative-making activity of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR. This ensured NFL victory at the elections. The NFL program, whose main task is Latvia's secession from the USSR system, is being put into effect by a majority of the deputies in almost all of the Soviets. The break in ties with the USSR will lead to a sharp reduction in the living standard of the population, aggravation of interethnic conflicts, and a restriction of personal rights and freedoms.

Under these conditions, there is a pressing need for coordinating the actions of the deputies of the Latvian SSR who stand for federalism and the defense of human

rights, and who support the platform formulated by USSR People's Deputies of the "Soyuz" group.

The Association of the Deputies Group of the Latvian SSR includes people's deputies of Soviets at all levels who share the following principles:

1. A Soviet Latvia in a structure of a renewed federation. Demarcation of jurisdiction between the Union and the republic on the basis of a Union treaty. Assurance of adherence to the Constitution and laws of the Union SSR on the territory of the republic.

2. The priority of human values over national and class values. The equality of rights of all residents of Latvia regardless of nationality, language, religious belief, political convictions, and period of residence in the republic, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

3. Economic independence of the producer on the basis of the economic independence of the republic. The creation of a single all-union market.

4. The provision of measures for the social protection of workers. The prevention of unemployment and poverty.

Latvian CP Delegate Election To CPSU Congress

90UN1788B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 19 Apr 90 p 3

[Resolution of Latvian Communist Party Central Committee: "On Procedures and Terms for the Election of Delegates to the 28th Congress from the Latvian Communist Party and the Conduct of the Report-Election Campaign in the Republic Party Organization"]

[Text] 1. To elect delegates from the Latvian Communist Party to the 28th CPSU Congress in accordance with established representational norms—one delegate from 4,000 CPSU members.

To hold direct elections of delegates in city and rayon party organizations according to party single mandate or multi-mandate electoral districts.

To establish the following voting procedure and to sum up its results:

—in voting, each CPSU member crosses out the names on the ballot only of those candidates against whom he is voting, and he leaves on the list only that candidate or those candidates (even several) who, in his opinion, deserve to be congress delegates;

—the elections are considered held if more than half of the CPSU members participate who are on the rolls of the party organization of the district. A candidate is considered elected who receives the greatest number of votes with respect to the other candidates, but not less than half of the number of CPSU members who took part in the voting.

2. To form a republic electoral commission (attached) for resolving questions connected with the organization of the conduct of the elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

To approve the Statement on the Republic Electoral Commission for the Conduct of Elections of Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress (attached).

3. To conduct the election of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress from the Latvian Communist Party prior to 1 June 1990.

4. To instruct the bureau of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party to develop specific recommendations on the organization of nominations and elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress from the Latvian Communist Party.

5. To conduct a report and election campaign of the party organization in the republic prior to 10 November 1990.

6. To analyze thoroughly the state of affairs in the party organizations at report and election party organizational meetings and conferences, to evaluate the activity of electoral party organs, and to determine measures for a radical improvement in organizational-party and ideological work in the light of decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress.

To conduct party meetings and conferences in a creative and confidential situation by bringing to light various points of view of communists, and by assuring respectful treatment for any opinion and the right of the minority to express its positions.

To create conditions so that real political fighters would attain leadership in party committees and organizations who are energetic and brave people capable of organizing matters well and breaking the impression in the public conscience that the party organ is a "bureaucratic, red-tape apparatus." To persistently attract to party work new forces from among communists who are dedicated to perestroika, especially persons of indigenous nationality who enjoy the support of party organizations, and who know how to use political methods.

Latvian CP Terms Citizens' Committees 'Unconstitutional'

90UN1788C Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 20 Apr 90 p 1

[Appeal by Bureau of Latvian Communist Party Central Committee: "Appeal to the Citizens of the Latvian SSR"]

[Text] These days, perestroika in our republic is undergoing a very difficult period in its development. The polarization of social forces and movements is continuing to intensify, and social tension is increasing.

So-called citizens' committees who appropriate the functions of state organs and constitutional structures of authority have intensified their confrontational and destructive activity in the political scene.

In this connection, citizens of the Latvian republic are being registered, and preparations are being accelerated for a congress of citizens of Latvia for the purpose of revising the political status of the Latvian SSR, seceding from the USSR system, and rejecting the socialist path of development.

In addition, those persons will be recognized as citizens of the republic who had citizenship of the Latvian republic according to the status of 17 June 1940, and their descendants.

The initiators of the creation of citizens' committees (DNNL, "Helsinki-86" group, Environmental Protection Club, and the radical NFL [Latvian People's Front] ignored the decree of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet of 13 July 1989, which considered the establishment and activity of citizens' committees to be illegal and contrary to the basic provisions of the Constitution of the Latvian SSR and legislation that was in force.

Moreover, activists of citizens' committees are bringing strong pressure on the new staffs of the Supreme Soviet and local soviets of the Latvian SSR and also on citizens at their jobs and places of residence.

Under these conditions, the bureau of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party regards the position taken by the citizens' committees as unconstitutional and a violation of human rights. It does not ensure a guaranteed future for the people of Latvia, but, on the contrary, it engenders uncertainty in tomorrow and concern for the fate of the present and future generations. This is not a path to a worthy life and general harmony, but the road to an unknown with dangers and disillusionments.

We appeal to all citizens of our republic, to people of all ages and professions, to consider soberly the imprudent measures, appeals, and actions on the part of the citizens' committees, and to refrain from unconstitutional registrations and elections and participation in measures associated with the violation of civil rights and freedoms that are sowing discord among the people.

With words of profound concern for the future of the people of Latvia, we also appeal to people's deputies at all levels to display statesmanlike wisdom and caution in arriving at decisions that involve the destiny of the people.

Founding Congress of Latvia's 'Soyuz' Deputies Group Held

90UNI788D Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
24 Apr 90 p 3

[Article by G. Pommere: "The Founding Congress of the Latvian 'Soyuz' Deputies Group"]

[Text] The constituent congress of the united "Soyuz" deputies group of the Latvian SSR was held last Sunday in the Political Education House in Riga.

S. Dimanis, people's deputy of the Latvian SSR, gave a report on the political situation in the republic. He said, in particular: It is very easy to vote for the Declaration of Independence of the Republic. It is also just as easy to cross out the past 50 years with several words. It is much more difficult to resolve the question about how to live further. A serious economic program must be the basis of state independence. For the time being, we hear scathing phrases, false radical solutions, and aspirations to achieve desired results quickly, without taking reality into account.

At the same time, I think that we would be acting improperly, if we contraposed the thoroughly vague idea of independence with the just as vague idea of a renewed federation. First, the right of the republic to secede from the USSR structure is recognized. Second, it is necessary to show that we believe that secession from the USSR structure today is premature. Third, it is necessary to fight for the signing of a new union treaty which guarantees the real sovereignty of Latvia. And, finally, we must elaborate all political and economic questions according to variants of possible events.

T. Zhdanok, Latvian SSR people's deputy, talked about the objectives and tasks of the "Soyuz" association in her speech.

After deliberations and debates, the congress adopted a number of resolutions, one of which, in particular, states: The united deputy group of the Latvian SSR "Soyuz" categorically protests the fact that the draft law on citizenship proposes to exclude combining republic and union citizenship, inasmuch as this simply denotes a rejection of USSR citizenship. A resolution was adopted "On Property as a Means of Production of Members of Work Collectives." A decision was also approved concerning instructions to the newly elected republic coordinating council of the united deputies group "Soyuz" of the Latvian SSR to found its own publishing organ by 1/6/90.

The congress also elected the chairman of the "Soyuz" deputies group. It is Viktor Alksnis, people's deputy of the USSR and the Latvian SSR.

Latvian Deputies' Letter to Gorbachev*90UN1511D Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Apr 90 p 3*

[Letter by Latvian SSR Soviet Socialist Republic people's deputies: "To M.S. Gorbachev, President of the USSR, and V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Council"]

[Text] We express deep concern in connection with the rulings of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, which endanger the course of perestroyka in our country.

Acknowledging the right of people to self-determination, and supporting the ruling of the third special USSR Congress of People's Deputies, we call upon you to resolve your disputes according to the guidance of the USSR Constitution. Responsibility before the peoples of the Lithuanian SSR and before the peoples of the entire Soviet Union for the rulings which have been passed is too great.

Latvian SSR people's deputies M.M. Gavrilov, A.A. Bartashevich, Ye.N. Yagupets, Ye.P. Drobot, S.P. Zaletayev, M.F. Rogal, B.A. Fershalov, I.P. Ivanov, L.L. Kurdyumov, V.N. Smirnov, E.E. Aboltinsh, A.A. Vidavskiy, V.A. Stefanovich, M.S. Ivanov, V.V. Zharkov, I.K. Prokofyev, V.K. Gaponenko, G.F. Romashev, V.A. Khodakovskiy, V.M. Gerasimov, A.G. Alekseyev, Yu.A. Lyalin, S.L. Dimans, O.N. Mantulnikov, M.D. Bekasov, N.V. Mikhaylov, G.D. Agafonov, T.A. Zhdanok, V.G. Rodin, V.F. Prishchepov, E.I. Makharev, V.I. Alksnis, E.P. Eglit, A.P. Rubiks, and A.N. Belukha.

Riga, 28 March 1990.

Warning to Latvians on Draft Evasion*90UN1511B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Apr 90 p 3*

[Unattributed article: "In the Latvian SSR Procuracy"]

[Text] On 31 March 1990 The Duma of the People's Front of Latvia [NFL] adopted an address proposing that the youths of Latvia of draft age evade the military draft for the Soviet Army. (Not to accept the summonses of the military commissars, not to appear at the draft boards.)

The address contains the slanderous statement that the Soviet Army, which liberated the Latvian people from the Nazi invaders, is supposedly an army of occupation.

In this manner the NFL Duma has called for the sabotage of the 29 March 1990 USSR Council of Ministers decree on a regular draft in April-June 1990 of citizens who have reached the age of 18 by the day of the draft.

These actions of the NFL are inflammatory and contradict the USSR Constitution, the Latvian SSR Constitution, and the appropriate Union and republic legislation.

Blinded by separatist ideas, in their statements and speeches on the mass media NFL figures and even some USSR and Latvian SSR people's deputies are clearly and irresponsibly inciting youths to commit state crimes.

As a result, the Latvian SSR Procuracy points out that military service in the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces is the constitutional duty of each of the republic's citizens.

Severe criminal liability is established according to Article 75 of the Latvian SSR Criminal Code for evading the regular draft for active military service.

Even with respect to those citizens for whom military service may, in individual, separate cases, be replaced by alternative (labor) service, evading this service also entails criminal liability according to Article 194.1 of the Latvian SSR Criminal Code.

These laws are familiar to the members of the NFL Duma.

But the NFL Duma is not at all concerned that as a result of its address youths, instead of carrying out their honorable military duties, will land in jail by trusting the officials of the NFL.

If the members of the NFL Duma do not have their own sons or if their fates are of no concern to them, then as politicians aspiring to important state and public posts they are obligated to care about the children of the citizens whose interests they are supposed to defend.

The actions of the NFL Duma and of the functionaries of several other public organizations agitating via the mass media for evasion of the regular draft for military service are an instigation to commit crimes.

The Latvian SSR procurator warns that the question of instituting criminal proceedings against the guilty will be decided in each case of draft evasion.

In addition, we appeal for good sense on the part of the conscripts themselves and for wisdom on the part of their families and friends.

Anti-Soviet Latvian Women's Meeting Hit*90UN1511C Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Apr 90 p 3*

[Statement: "To the USSR General Procurator, the Latvian SSR Procurator, and the editors of the newspapers SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA and ZA RODINY"]

[Text] On 29 March 1990 the Latvian television program "Panorama" showed a meeting which took place in Riga at the Park of the Communards, sponsored by the "League of Latvian Women."

We are no longer surprised by those pogrom speeches directed against the CPSU and the Soviet Armed Forces and delivered at the meeting by its organizers, one of

whom is, unfortunately, E. Repshe, Latvian SSR people's deputy. We are also not shocked that the meetings participants, allegedly speaking in the name of all the mothers of Latvia, were carrying placards that say "CP=SS" (read: "The Communist Party is an SS organization") and "Occupiers! Your Motherland is calling you home."

But we are surprised, shocked, and filled with indignation at something else. How long will the law enforcement organs remain inactive with regard to the fact that people are speaking against the constitutional system in the country? How long will an effective struggle for a rule-of-law state be supplanted by empty discourses at the various levels of power?

We believe that by putting an equals sign between communists and fascist assault detachments, the meeting's organizers insulted the honor and the dignity not only of the communists but of all the honest people of the country and the world who did not spare even their own lives in the struggle with the brown plague of the 20th century, and they belittled the honor and the dignity of their children and grandchildren who have joined the struggle for the democratic renewal of the life of Soviet society, which was begun and developed with the CPSU as initiator and in the vanguard role.

We strongly demand that there be a transition from words about the constitutional guarantees of the defense of the existing social order to deeds, that criminal proceedings be instituted against the meeting's organizers and the specific people who carried placards insulting the honor and the dignity of communists and the Armed Forces, and that the leadership of Latvian television be made to answer for the dissemination of anti-Soviet ideas and for stirring up interethnic discord.

Communists, servicemen, workers, and employees of the Soviet Army and Navy of the Riga Red-Banner Higher Military Political School imeni Marshal of the Soviet Union S.S. Biryuzov (175 signatures).

Calls for Militia Aid to Lithuania Hit

*90UN1511A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Apr 90 p 1*

[Address: "To Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and Comrade Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] Respected Comrade President!

Respected Comrade Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet!

The political situation in the republics of the Soviet Baltic region continues to intensify and is approaching a fateful line.

Speaking on republic television, D. Ivans, leader of the People's Front of Latvia and USSR people's deputy,

called for volunteers to be recruited from the employees of the Latvian militia and sent to Lithuania to help the new leadership of the republic form armed detachments. His appeal was taken up by the mass media of the republic. The collection of equipment and registration of volunteers to aid "an independent Lithuania" are being organized.

The number of spoken and written threats of physical violence against servicemen, members of their families, and veterans of war, labor, and the Armed Forces is increasing. This gives rise to a reaction, which often takes the form of demands that the military command distribute weapons for self-defense, which increases the tension still more.

We, officers of the Air Force of the Baltic Military District, strongly protest inflammatory and provocative appeals and actions leading to an intensification and escalation of the conflict, which is increasingly taking on a regional character.

Before these appeals become reality, before the blood of innocent people flows, we demand, comrade president, your firm intervention, which we already have witnessed this day in one form—the introduction of presidential rule in Lithuania.

Adopted 30 March 1990 at a meeting of officers and communists of the administration of the Air Force Baltic Military District.

Ukrainian CP Central Committee Plenum Reviewed

*90UN1535B Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 14,
Apr 90 p 2*

[Report by Nikolay Baklanov: "The Ukraine. A Step Toward Sovereignty"]

[Text] 3 April—The Ukrainian CP Central Committee plenum that took place last week was a very important event in the political life of the Ukrainian SSR.

At the plenum resolution were passed to convene the republic 28th Communist Party Congress on 19 June this year and to conduct the accountability-and-election campaign (without setting the dates exactly) during 1990.

In addition to these documents the plenum worked on and approved another two resolutions of extreme importance, namely, "On the Political and Economic Sovereignty of the Ukraine" and "For Strengthening the Unity of the Party Ranks."

In the opening part of the former it states that the course toward consistent affirmation of the political and economic sovereignty of the Ukrainian SSR as part of a renewed Soviet Federation should become a reliable foundation for the consolidation of all progress forces, dealing with the crisis phenomena in the sociopolitical

and economic spheres, and creating proper living conditions for all people living in the republic. The most important factors in sovereignty were defined as full popular power for the people of the Ukraine on their own territory, the territorial chain of command in the Ukrainian SSR, independence in determining the institutions and symbols of statehood and the administrative-territorial arrangement, the right of the republic to define and decide which issues it will transfer to the union organs, the priority of republic laws over legislative enactments of the USSR, the creation of a legal foundation and mechanism to safeguard the economic interests of the republic, and the establishment of the Ukrainian SSR as a real entity under international law, and number of other provisions.

The plenum entrusted the communists who are USSR people's deputies from the republic and the people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR with the task of participating actively in work on a new USSR Union Treaty and a law on the competence of the USSR and the union republics, and also called for a review of the draft law "On the Economic Sovereignty of the Ukrainian SSR" in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

At the same time those attending the plenum spoke out unambiguously against any attempts by separatist forces to use the situation for nationalist ends or to whip up national egoism and enmity, and it decisively rejected calls from extremists elements for the republic's secession from the USSR.

With regard to the second resolution, sound justification for it was given by many of the communists speaking at the plenum, including CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee V. Ivashko. Describing the present sociopolitical situation in the republic, he emphasized that essentially the communists there are already operating under the conditions of a multiparty system. In this situation, factionalism in the Communist Party is its direct road to ruin. This is exactly why it is essential decisively to delineate the platforms and groupings that are trying to destroy and split the party from within. Loyalty to Marxist-Leninist teaching and communist ideals and defending the unity of the party ranks on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism were named as the decisive criteria for this delineation.

Proceeding from these criteria, V. Ivashko emphasized, the so-called "democratic platform" that is essentially an alternative to the platform of the CPSU Central Committee platform for the congress, is unacceptable to us.

At the plenum a principled assessment was also offered of the behavior of certain people who have announced their resignation from the party, and of the leaders and activists in "Rukh," (including, in particular, I. Drach, D. Pavlychko and V. Yavorivskiy), who quite recently were quite happy with their membership in the CPSU. As our weekly has already reported, they announced

their intention of creating a new party and immediately started to hurl groundless accusations at the CPSU. The Ukrainian CP Central Committee Secretariat expressed its attitude toward this in a decision published in the local press. The Ukrainian CP Central Committee Commission for Party Control has expelled a number of "Rukh" activists from the party for actions incompatible with membership in the CPSU. This line was supported at the plenum and it was announced that this line should be pursued firmly and consistently everywhere.

Incidentally, the "cruel course of the political struggle" in the republic which was talked about at the plenum can also be seen from the fact that simultaneously with the plenum an unsanctioned meeting organized by "Rukh" was taking place in Kiev in support of the independence of the Lithuanian SSR. The sponsors of this meeting were forbidden to hold it on the grounds that it "might do serious harm to the political efforts to regulate the situation with respect to events in the Lithuanian SSR." The Ukrainian CP Central Committee and republic Council of Ministers expressed their negative attitude toward this idea of "Rukh" and published an appropriate appeal and resolution. Notwithstanding, the meeting on the square around the republic stadium did take place. The speeches heard at it understandably covered not only the events in Lithuania. As always, a considerable part of the speakers' efforts were devoted to attempts to discredit the CPSU in general and the Ukrainian Communist Party in particular, and to disparage their role and significance in perestroika in society. Objective, however, demands that we say that in these attacks the "reality" was often replaced by the "desired." For it is, to say the least, frivolous to predict the rapid political demise of the Ukrainian Communist Party if one takes into account the fact that according to the results of the alternative elections that have taken place in the republic, of the total number of people's deputies elected more than 85 percent are communists. And it is precisely largely through their activity in the soviets at all levels of the Ukrainian Communist Party that it is planned to embody the program that has been outlined.

Resignation of Chernigov Oblast First Secretary Examined

90UN1386A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
31 Mar 90 p 2

[Article by Aleksandr Karanda: "Resignation: On the Reasons for and Lessons of the Fall of the Party Obkom First Secretary"]

[Text] Chernigov Oblast—Everyone was stunned by what happened. While this event was a cause for dismay and confusion for some; for others it restored their faith in the reformation of life. Even now, two months later, the resignation of the "first" is upsetting for Chernigovites, and gives rise to disputes and meditation. The moreso, since something like this had already taken place in Tyumen, Volgograd and Ivano-Frankovsk.

What brought about the resignation and what caused it? We shall try to reflect on this event at leisure, while keeping those stormy and literally lightening-fast events at arms length. We shall try to compare this rapidly-flowing time of perestroyka, compressed into two or three days, and the period of many years which preceded it, which embodies the style of work and the character of the first secretary—who is, frankly, a man with exceptional organizational abilities and strong-willed qualities. Then, perhaps, we'll be able to answer the question.

Where and when did Leonid Ivanovich Palazhchenko step over that invisible line, after which the people lost their faith in him and the relationship became distorted between him, "the powers that be," and the others who carried out his orders?

Well, it was not in those busy workdays as a secretary, when he would wheel about from morning to late at night in his raykom UAZik [Ulyanov Automobile Plant] automobile, going from one kolkhoz to another, to the largest kolkhoz in the oblast; in perhaps what is the the most complex, and the most hapless rayon, Chernigov Rayon, from whose villages the city had literally "drawn out" the people, into its first large construction projects. Entire brigades, families and streets had moved there. Yes, he then stopped this flow. And yes, at that time everyone knew him on sight, both young and old, and not only the aktiv.

His energy, his boldness and his readiness to hear out anyone were then known to the people, with whom he could move mountains. And the rayon, whose sandy soil and podzol was yielding no more than a dozen centners of grain per hectare and a hundred centners of potatoes, suddenly "got itself together" and began to yield unheard-of harvests for the woodland region: 25 centners of grain per hectare, and more than 200 of potatoes; and he began to regularly fulfill plans for procurement of animal products as well.

He took pride in being a man of energy, and at that time depended mostly on the kolkhoz chairmen to carry out his plans—steady people, strong-willed, perhaps even severe, categorical like a commander; but nevertheless, people true to their responsibility and their mission, "to feed the country." They were capable of "giving their utmost" for the sake of the plan, but they could also find a crack in the wall of funding limits, and "knock out" that extra tractor, or a milking machine, bricks or cement... They burned themselves out at work, constantly maneuvering between the instructions and orders from on high, and the common sense of the peasants. I suppose they had to have special energy for this, and extraordinary strength; and at times, even "extraordinary" morals. They looked to the future, it seems, over the people's heads, devoutly believing in the fact that "the present generation of Soviet people would live under Communism..."

And without this faith, how could they have carried out one absolute command after another—whether to tear

away the private subsidiary farms from the peasant households; or to collectivize the privately-owned cattle of the kolkhoz members; or for total "kukuruzatsiya" [planting corn] of the fields; and then for eliminating the unpromising villages? How could they have done all that without faith? And for the sake of this very faith it was completely impossible for them not to give up, just once or twice, the so-called "particulars" of human needs and peasant interests, and not to cast them at times on the altar of faith as a sacrifice to the System.

We note that not once, neither in the Komsomol nor as "The First" did he scorn to offer a kind word to the workers. That's how the wise kolkhoz "heads" acted too: it's easier to praise a little, joke a little, and ask about life, than to pay them what they are worth for their priceless labor. You look up, and he's defused the situation; the milkmaids are laughing and joking with him in response... And then they take up the bucket-yoke again, in order to haul water to the farm. And if someone would try to remind him that in party work, the main things are people, their working and living conditions, he would usually counter with the well-known tenet of Lenin, that for us economics is the most interesting policy. And the point... And right then I suppose he would divide the meaning of these words into their two component parts: economics as a whole, and productive forces and their production relationships, that is, people with their relationship to the means of production. And once that is established, then policy too is not simply "bare" centners and cubic meters, but living human flesh with their joys and sorrows.

But the System did not teach him to read Lenin that way then.

In the early 1970's he defended his dissertation in competition for the title of Candidate of Economic Sciences. At that time many of his colleagues were "defending themselves"—a veritable stream of young scholars-cum-party officials were supposed to be greasing the drive belts of the economic mechanism by means of their highly-trained intellect. And he too made his defense.

The rayon, of course, was not standing still either; it too received a kind of "degree:" new construction complexes, mechanical workshops, airfields, and storage places for mineral fertilizers. And what could one say? It seemed that things were going well both in the fields and on the farms. He produced dozens of award-winners in "his own" rayon. Those were good, simply marvelous years for him! He acquired a solid portfolio of practical knowledge of organization of agricultural production—not the kind you can get in any academy. But the main thing is, that he could see, he could understand, he could sense that in the "root system" of management he was not prepared for a branch, but a key position.

One word from him—and the "peasant regiments" would switch from defense to the offense; one word from

him—and they would modify the sowing and the structure of the farms. He could do things in such a way that any kolkhoz, even one which was in poor condition yesterday, would become economically sound in a short time, and a strong one would “land on” the stringent rations of funds and funding ceilings and would defend its positions. It seemed like he could do anything. Perhaps it was because of this that his voice was hard as steel, and his glance was that of a cool, all-knowing person who understands everything. Under this glance, even the most obstinate people would wilt. And those who could give him any argument became fewer and fewer.

In 1976 he pinned the golden star of Hero of Labor to the lapel of his jacket.

Perhaps it was then the thought first occurred to him: Perhaps I've been in the rayon too long? Already some of his contemporaries from Komsomol days had ascended to higher posts—one was an oblast executive committee chairman; others had become ministers... And so what's keeping him back?

The offer came unexpectedly: secretary “for the rural area” at Volyn.

Clenching his fists with all his might, he went. To those closest to him, he promised, “I'll be back. Just think of it as an extended business trip.” But in a matter of months, a plenum of the obkom secretaries elected him to be “number one.”

What did he start with? As before, he counted on the help of firm, strong-willed managers; people capable of holding the collectives “in their fist” for the sake of the plan, in order that they would “look like people” in the republic, in the branch, and in the Union. These were tried and true people. Not without their faults, of course, in earthly matters; but for the sake of the “heavenly paradise,” they could make any problem knuckle under. Their strictness did no harm to the cause, the moreso since the times increasingly tied their hands; the drums sounded louder and louder around them, his medals and stars glittered, and He “Himself” was well-disposed toward his ideas. No doubt the future looked bright and hopeful to him. After all, he had everything it takes: practical work experience, a scholarly degree, and medals. And he had the “comradely associations,” without which one can move neither right nor left, but draw you ever higher upwards...

In 1984 the time came for him to return to Chernigov. But now he was already “number one” in the party obkom.

The country was living in expectation of a sharp turn, and the time of stormy changes was knocking at the door. People such as he were convinced that this would be “their time”—a time to firm up one's will; a time to establish order; a time when “the firsts” themselves would muster their will, and increasingly concentrate in themselves all the nerves and all the blood vessels of

control. And that is just what the reforms in life meant to him. He was ready to accept such reforms, taking into account both his knowledge and experience, and his personal qualities. As before, he was not afraid of the burden placed on his shoulders.

He started out with energy... And quickly changed the cadre, both in the obkom apparat and in the localities—in the party raykoms and gorkoms. Not everyone accepted this with the proper understanding. But, he, “the first,” wanted to work with people who thought like him; with people who would “grasp” his ideas and be quick on the uptake; who could not and would not dare contradict him; and who were still well-known in the rayon. Certain ones, those who enjoyed his special trust, he took with him to Volyn. And certain people were forced to leave. What else could they do? He never forgot personal criticism.

At the same time everyone could see and understand this: the new “first” was really new—even in his speeches and promises; even in his manner of delivery from the rostrum. He spoke loudly and pounded on the podium; but you have to give him this: he was popular and approachable.

Many remembered: he held conferences with kolkhoz chairmen in his first days, and told the assembly that when he was working in Volyn, he had set up the very cheapest market in Lutsk, and that there would be one like that in Chernigov very soon. But he required sowing no more than four million seeds per hectare, and taking a calf away from its mother only after it had sucked her dry... “And whoever does not agree with me, put on your coat and go home,” he summed up at that memorable conference of chairmen.

Changes were seen everywhere on kolkhozes and sovkhoses: shelters were built for the hay; milking sections were set up; artificial insemination points were established... For some reason this point was ranked among the top priorities. They started a dialogue with the “firsts” of the rayons; heads “flew” because of them and “harsh entries” were made. In sonorous speeches at numerous meetings of the aktiv and at conferences, “new” concepts began to be heard: cyclogram; the “auroch [Bos primogenius] test” [Turovoy opros]; and others, pertaining to zootechnology, agronomy and veterinary questions.

The rural area was being choked due to lack of building materials, but the desire to rapidly fix up his city did not yet permit him to “turn his face” to that problem. They began by whitewashing the border areas in the proper manner, and proceeded to “systematic” construction of administrative buildings. It was his desire that the “high-placed guests” whom he was expecting, to resolve problems both great and small, could see with their own eyes how the appearance of Chernigov had been transformed under him. True, the waiting lists for apartments reached many tens of thousands, and young specialists, especially

teachers and medics sent to the rural area, preferred to move to the neighboring oblasts—where they were offered housing.

A shadow of concern began to fall upon problems of ideological work, questions of intraparty life, and questions of glasnost and democracy. Somehow these were regarded as side-issues. "The First" saw strictly concrete indicators before him: so many tons of meat; so much of milk, grain and potatoes. For this what do you need? New production technology, the ingrained experience of specialists, equipment, feed, building materials. Yes, of course, there are still people issues; but what is needed is—order and discipline. This will be a concentrated economy; and that is his policy.

He was just about to introduce a "new" form of work with the party-economic aktiv. Since the morning, at about 0700 all the first administrators of the oblast had been assembled around the obkom building. A quick briefing, and the order was given to "mount up." There were two and sometimes three "Icarus," [possibly, light aircraft] and out ahead, the flashing light of a police car. And so it went from one rayon, to another, and to a third. For up to 200 bosses in the region it was a massed strike, from which the rayons and villages would not recover for a long time. These raids ceased only after publication of an article in PRAVDA, "Instead of Deeds..." It turned out they did not understand his "new" methods!

Yes, it's possible that the woodlands had by that time given their last. On the other hand, they were in the top five in the republic for meat procurement, and in the top ten for milk procurement. They gave up nearly all their potatoes and flax. And in exchange they were to receive equipment, building materials and fertilizers. However, no exchange of equal value came about. But was he really to blame for that?

And that is how it came about, that in terms of procurement, they were nearly in first place; but in supplying the people's needs—they were last. At the obkom they were reconciled to this. But the people were not. They sent a banner reading, "Who Ate All My Meat?" to a meeting. He explained, as he could, about above-plan procurement from the oblast, because there are not enough processing enterprises. They did not accept the explanation. They castigated him with the unrealized capacities of the Priluki Meat Combine, with the exaggerated reporting and extravagances of the bosses both great and small, and with the outrageous situation in trade.

And they held him up to reproach for inaction following the Chernobyl catastrophe. They say that Gomel and Zhitomir Oblasts, and even Bryansk Oblast, were better supplied, as victims. And Chernigov—70 kilometers, was "in direct line," and did not catch on? Of course he is no specialist; but it was clear that at that time the misfortune had touched the oblast, and especially the villages along the Dnepr... Could he not have sounded the alarm to the republic? He probably could have, but

the republic already had more than enough problems without his demands—and why add to them? He did not want to disturb them...

After all, if, let's say the raykom had come to him with demands, how would he have reacted? He would have "put them in their place." Well, they could have done the same to him. No, it was not in his nature to disturb the republic and the center. In the oblast he was master: whatever you say, this is your business; and why should you bring your "oblast" problems to the republic?

Perhaps this is where he crossed the line dividing his interests from the people's interests? But no. After all, it was not for his own sake that he was working himself to death, under stress, traveling about the oblast, bringing together specialists for advice, and assembling the "firsts" from the rayons and the "oblastniks," inspiring and interceding: More production is needed. The oblast will make a concerted effort, and no one will go unnoticed.

The press did not ignore the situation; but how? There was Andreyev, director of a building trust transferred from Volyn, who was accused of inflating reports; and there were the administrators from certain rayons, accused of violating moral standards. Well, you see, the leaders of Menskiy Rayon went hunting on the borders of a wildlife refuge. Whereas before people would overlook these things, now it's come down to satirical articles in PRAVDA. And certain truth-seekers cast aside all restraint... They demand that administrative buildings be given lower priority than social objectives—hospitals, children's combines, and a hospital for invalids. It is understood that there are excesses—can one really look out for everyone? But neither can one protect from general criticism the cadres which he himself had chosen; some for their dachas, others for amoral behavior, and still others for incompetence. Does that mean that all of them suddenly are bad? Is there any kind of logic at all here? It is, after all, probably more clear to him, the "first," who is worth what. He is responsible for the prestige of his own cadres, and he makes them answerable to himself. Personally...

He sought and did not always find the answers to the questions posed by the times. Just take for example the matter of the Menskiy hunting trip. People have been accused of spinelessness with respect to A.S. Ponomarenko, the "first" of the Menskiy Raykom. Well what of it? Perhaps he wasn't punished enough. But who is Ponomarenko anyway? A former kolkhoz chairman. What's more, he wasn't a bad chairman; as they say, he passed through fire, water and copper pipes. So? Should he lose his head because he went hunting with "necessary" people? Many people have become too straitlaced in their conception of honesty and principle.

Or, take another unanswerable question: the Obkom House. Chernigovites were complimentary when he arrived from Volyn, and was about to move into an ordinary "worker's" house. And he heard about the

people's good opinion of him. But... Would it not have been naive to remain in his previous apartment, into which of course he moved temporarily? Yes, they put up a building with improved planning—a three-story building with 12 apartments. Of course it was not so good that only members and candidate members of the bureau turned up there.

The times... Yes, it was the times that did not accept him. And the people, who had been waiting for these times. They had endured these times. And he, it turns out, is from another time? As a symbol of yesterday; as a symbol of that system which was nurtured and lived in those yesterdays. Perhaps... But why so abruptly? After all, a lot of thought had been given, and for the people. Was he too late? People are impatient in their expectations, and want to have everything right now, today. He understands this. But nothing falls out of the skies. You must wait a little longer, and have patience.

For some reason his aides did not stand beside him. Where did their readiness to stand with him go; to share with him their common guilt? They were willing to share the glory, success and victories. One recalls that after the organizational plenum which followed the reporting and election conference, all members of the newly-elected obkom unanimously voted for electing him first secretary. And here, a year later, at the plenum almost all were in favor of his resignation. How can one explain such a metamorphosis?

It turns out that one person has to be responsible for the shortcomings. Just one, really? No, not one, but the entire ossified system of views, customs, habits and methods...

Yes, of course one could call this his personal drama. But that would hardly be correct. It is more likely the drama of all that which comprised the flesh and blood of the command-bureaucratic system; even though fraught with great difficulties, it is still not only the outpost of our economy, but of our entire lives. And he, nevertheless, did not play the final role in it. No, not the final one...

With this, one might bring to an end the attempt to investigate the phenomenon "from within." Were it not for one circumstance. The fact of the matter is, that the "Chernigov Meetings" were continued in certain rayon centers.

And what were the people demanding? Once again, resignations. They were insisting upon the departure of those who one way or another had compromised themselves or had zealously professed the previous command-administrative work style. In this connection there is, frankly speaking, a sad generalization: just a few years ago these noisy political meetings took place only in the capital cities. And now they have penetrated the provincial bounds—the oblast and rayon centers.

There is nowhere else to go; farther on is the village, with its critical problems, the solution of which also depends

in the final analysis upon the energies of "meeting democracy." With all its positive aspects, it is not excluded that it might lead to a situation in which tomorrow its "cost" will rise to the cost of a loaf of bread and a bottle of milk. That this is a very costly price, one would think everyone understands. But then why are the problems of the village being dragged out and solved so slowly? Why is it that even today, the peasant, while making the rounds of the offices in the raykom, rayispolkom and higher, is getting nowhere and returns to his own concerns?

The last thing I want is that the reader would take what I've written as one more attempt at the muck-raking that is so popular today. And in the final analysis it is not a matter of one person's resignation; after all, that of itself will not solve a single one of the thousands of problems we have. They can and must be resolved by the rapidly evolving system of cardinal new production relationships, laws and reforms, which are also opening before us, in our troubles, a vision of the new day that is coming, on which thousands of hopes are riding.

But we shall not hasten this birth by fiery calls to destroy everything, "down to the foundation, and then..." We put our faith in those who have summoned up the courage and responsibility to replace those who have departed. They must change, for the conditions of today are entirely different, and they will define their actions and their behavior, their conscience and their feeling of responsibility. And one would think that they will also draw lessons from times past which inspired other leaders. Those, who have resigned and departed.

Lvov City Soviet Elects Leadership

90UN1718A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 7 Apr 90 p 3

[Article by O. Telenchi: "The People of Lvov Are Awaiting Results"]

[Text] The in-session newly-elected Lvov City Soviet has approved a political declaration which states that municipal authority is passing to the agencies of the people. The document states that interference by any party or public organization into the activities of the soviets shall not be tolerated. The people's deputies called for consolidation on the part of all persons concerned for the city's future: representatives of various civic organizations, of various nationalities, and religious believers of various denominations. The newly-elected Soviet contains 143 deputies, including 32 members of the CPSU.

Party-unaffiliated Vasyl Shpitser, candidate of technical sciences and member of the presidium of the oblast council of the Ukrainian Language Society imeni T. H. Shevchenko, was elected chairman of the Lvov City Soviet of People's Deputies. Party member Bohdan Kotyk was elected chairman of the executive committee; he was also the previous holder of this office.

The chairman of the Soviet and the chairman of the executive committee, who were elected on an alternative basis [there were alternative candidates], have taken the oath of office. Thousands of Lvov residents, gathered by the city executive committee building, also shared in the session, for proceedings were broadcast onto the square by loudspeaker.

The session of the City Soviet also approved the use of national symbols on an equal footing with state symbols. Henceforth the blue-and-yellow flag will fly alongside the state flag on the city hall building and atop the High Castle.

The turmoil of emotions around the election is gradually subsiding. A great deal of faith has been invested in the elected people's deputies. And now the people of Lvov are expecting real changes and the resolution of a great many of this city's acute problems, which can be achieved only by everyone rolling up their sleeves. A great deal of difficult work lies ahead.

Presidential Council Member Revenko Interviewed

90UN1718B Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 8 Apr 90 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Kiev Oblast Party Committee First Secretary Grigoriy Ivanovych Revenko, by RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent L. Yanyuk: "How We Shall Respond to the Call of the Times"]

[Text] An organizational question is on the party committee agenda.... Recently such a fact has unfortunately frequently evoked anxiety and bitterness.

But for the members of the Kiev Oblast Party Committee, this organizational matter was both unexpected and exciting. And they took up the matter with a shade of sorrow but at the same time with joy and pride. Those present at the plenary session offered sincere and warm congratulations to USSR People's Deputy and Oblast Committee First Secretary Hryhoryy Ivanovych Revenko on being named a member of the USSR Presidential Council, expressed thanks for his many years of work in the oblast, and wished him success in his new field of endeavor.

Our interview with H. I. Revenko took place just after he had submitted his resignation as oblast committee first secretary and A. I. Kykot had been elected his successor on an alternative basis [multiple candidates].

* * *

[Correspondent] My first questions, Grigoriy Ivanovych, will be the traditional ones: How do you feel about your new appointment? Was it a surprise to you as well? Do you already feel that special weight, by virtue of its newness and responsibility, on your shoulders?

[Revenko] Naturally I feel it. But first of all I would like to say that few people would be able precisely to predict the events in their lives. Of course people can have

specific goals. I have not had such a specific career goal as becoming a member of the Presidential Council, for example. There was my regular work—as oblast committee first secretary and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. And of course I had no inkling of what lay ahead. Therefore the new appointment took me by surprise and, I must confess, was a pleasant surprise for me, for if I said that I might have declined such an appointment or that I felt hesitation, I would be less than sincere.

I have a great deal of regard for my new appointment. And I am aware that it imposes an enormous responsibility—for I shall be working in full view of the entire people. Responsibility for my actions as a member of the Presidential Council, for my personal actions, and for assessment of everything that is currently happening in this country: for presenting proposals, following thorough examination of an issue, which could genuinely improve things.

Only by total assimilation of an entire mass of information, and information which is not at all embellished and not superficial, but purely truthful and objective, is it possible correctly to evaluate current realities and future steps. A political official must be totally honest and upright.

[Correspondent] Grigoriy Ivanovych, how long have you been acquainted with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev?

[Revenko] I have known Mikhail Sergeyevich since 1984, that is, from the time I was asked to work in the CPSU Central Committee. The fact is that I directly participated in preparations both for the well-known March and April Central Committee plenums (1985) and for a number of other important events held that year, in particular a conference on scientific and technological advance. That is, at that time I was spending all my time on matters which in one way or another involved Gorbachev. And I met with Mikhail Sergeyevich even more frequently when I was serving as first secretary, in handling a great many nonroutine problems, particularly those involving the Chernobyl disaster. And I always had his support and, which is very important, his understanding. But it is hard for me to say precisely what played a role in the President's choice.

[Correspondent] Have the areas and directions of work to be taken by the council members, and your work in particular, been specified?

[Revenko] I believe that the issues with which each individual member of the Presidential Council will deal will be narrow and precisely specified. This is so that the individual can master to the fullest possible extent the entire range of information in his field. This was discussed in general terms at the first meeting of the council, to wit: each council member is to deal with some one area. And the very selection of Presidential Council members attests to this.

I feel that the Presidential Council and the President himself must continue perseveringly implementing a

policy of perestroika, coming forth with major initiatives. I see no other path of development of society, no matter how difficult it is for all of us at present and perhaps in these next few years as well. If our people would become aware of this fact and, for example, yield somewhat in their current demands, I believe that we shall succeed in having a modern society—an integral society united by idea and deed, a society of which one can be proud.

[Correspondent] How would you, as a professional party worker, assess the fact that in his first address to the members of the council, the President, concentrating attention on social and economic issues, did not devote attention to acute party issues?

[Revenko] My personal view of the problem is as follows: taking into consideration the decisions of recent Central Committee plenums and the Congress of People's Deputies, we are standing at the threshold of a multiparty system. And it is natural that the Presidential Council must consider this fact in its work. The president cannot be an advocate of some one thing. There must be flexibility in the council's work. I am unequivocally in favor of the CPSU continuing to bear the entire weight of responsibility for the decisions which are made. And the party will endeavor to ensure that its prestige does not decline but increases—this is a very important task at the present time. I believe, however, that there is no need for the Presidential Council to supplant the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat or Politburo.

I am deeply convinced, and I spoke about this at the first meeting of the council, that we need to specify precisely all structures of governmental authority. There is the Presidential Council, there is the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers, and the system of law enforcement agencies. Duties must be clearly and precisely distributed among these structures. Without this the Presidential Council could easily become bogged down in trivialities.

I am firmly convinced that the Presidential Council should deal with two main issues—national security, and national consensus. Other agencies of authority should assume all other issues. Although the President will of course take part in legislative activities, since he is empowered to do so. That is, we must thoroughly think through the mutual relations between all agencies of authority. There must be guarantees against authoritarian rule.

[Correspondent] Were there debates during the first meeting? And on what issues did the members of the Presidential Council reach agreement?

[Revenko] Of course there were, but I would not use the term debate, but rather exchange of views. All council members were unanimous, however, in specifying three fundamental problems which are critical at the present time and which must definitely be given priority in seeking solution: these include radicalization of the

economy, the agrarian sector, and the matter of federation. The sequence in which I have listed them does not indicate their relative importance. These items are equally acute and interwoven. For that reason, I believe, our unanimity in specifying these items is understandable. Right now it is a matter of specific steps to be taken by the Presidential Council and personally by the President. We must look for answers to the demands of the time....

[Correspondent] I can sense that you are already totally involved in your new job.... But bidding farewell to one's comrades always brings sorrow, and a few minutes ago you were saying something to this effect from the speaker's stand....

[Revenko] Of course there is sorrow. All of us grow attached to certain things and certain people.... I have worked here with good people, who understood me and who helped me a great deal. I am sincerely grateful to everybody and I have no intention of severing ties with the oblast. If people will put their trust in me, I shall carry out my deputy's obligations. I have the moral duty to do everything possible in order to accomplish as quickly as possible the program of recovery from the disaster at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. I believe that I shall be taking active part in drawing up a national program for recovery from the accident and the Chernobyl disaster.

[Correspondent] What will your salary be, inless that is confidential? Believe me, this is not only my woman's curiosity.... Several people have written to the newspaper asking this question.

[Revenko] I don't know yet what my salary will be. I am sure, however, that it will be announced publicly. I realize that for everybody this is a vital question, and for me also. But I did not raise the question, considering it inappropriate, for something of greater importance was at issue.

[Correspondent] I would like for a moment to return to the past. Were the results of the vote at the plenum a surprise to you? I would imagine that you are not indifferent to the question of who will be taking over for you....

[Revenko] I was expecting a different outcome.... I frankly expected Ivan Stepanovych Plyushch to win, although not by a wide margin. It was an election with more than one candidate, and it was no surprise to the oblast's Communists that the oblast committee bureau nominated A. Kykot and I. Plyushch as candidates, for five months back a list of available cadres for all positions was published in the newspaper KYIVSKA PRAVDA.

I have always defended and I continue to defend the right both of the individual and of the collective body to express one's opinion but not to force one's opinion on others.

[Correspondent] And, finally, what parting word do you have for the newly-elected oblast committee first secretary?

[Revenko] I would say the following. First: a hard-working nature is very important for any job. Second: the ability to listen, not try to present one's own opinion as the truth in the final instance, although I am of the conviction that a first secretary must have the ability to defend his own point of view, to persuade others, and to prove the correctness of his view on a basis of equality. If these conditions are met, nobody will feel pushed down by somebody else's authority....

I would like very much for the Kiev Oblast party organization to preserve a spirit of comradeship and mutual respect, with genuine mutual demandingness. Then everybody will have an equal chance, an equal opportunity at the outset, without favoritism and misuse of personal likes and dislikes. I am convinced of this.

I would like very much for the atmosphere of equality, equality of opportunity, and mutual respect to be preserved.

[Correspondent] But what about a spirit of competition, which is the motivating force of progress, creativity, a striving for self-expression?

[Revenko] It certainly exists. And I am glad. It was clearly present during the elections. And I deliberately urged everybody to take part in the election campaign. After this experience people become different, enriched. This is especially important right now, to emerge from the protection of one's office out into the open, to the ordeal of piercing questions. The thing I appreciate the most, for example, is the fact that I would be asked between 150 and 200 questions. This means that people are interested in you as an individual. One must appreciate this fact. And these are not simply questions: they are testing your mettle. And it is important for the

person answering the questions to be clear about just who he is. I always had a hard and fast rule: to speak sincerely and to speak the truth, no matter how unpleasant the truth might be....

* * *

After congratulating him on his election victory, I asked A. I. Kykot, the newly-elected first secretary of the Kiev Oblast Party Committee, for a brief interview.

"I shall begin," said Anatoliy Ivanovych, "by stating that I have obviously come to the position of party oblast committee first secretary at a turning point.... A new Soviet of People's Deputies has been elected, and new structures of government are being created.

"It is very gratifying that the voters have shown their faith in the Communists of Kiev Oblast, especially the rayon committee first secretaries who ran as candidates for people's deputy. Even today the majority of rayon committee first secretaries have been elected chairmen of the soviets. We must now redispense our forces. It is important that the chairman of a soviet not merely be a functionary occupying two desks but that he do everything possible to ensure that the soviet proceeds to operate in a businesslike manner, innovatively and productively.

"That is, new mutual operation methods are needed, so that it does not end up that the party body administrative apparatus becomes an adjunct of the chairman of the soviet, or that the soviet on the other hand does not become an adjunct of the party committee bureau.

"And in order to accomplish this we need first and foremost a new view of the role of party members in the soviets and in workforces. It is necessary to breathe new strength into the primary party organizations, in order to accomplish in fact rule by the party masses within the party."

Belorussian Independence Date Rejected

90UN1547B Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSIYA
in Russian 23 Mar 90 p 1

[Article by Ispolkom Chairman V.I. Mikhasev and Secretary L.N. Volodkina: "Decision of the Ispolkom of the Minsk City Soviet of People's Deputies; On the Statement of Citizen Z.S. Poznyak, Yu.V. Khodyko, and A.A. Marochkin"]

[Text] The ispolkom of the Minsk City Soviet of People's Deputies, having examined the statement of Citizens Poznyak Z.S., Khodyko, Yu.V. and Marochkin A.A., on holding the celebration of "Belorussian Independence Day, Dedicated to the 72nd Anniversary of the Proclamation of the BNR [Belorussian People's Republic]," on 25 March 1990, in the form of mass processions, a meeting on V.I. Lenin Square and an artistic production, notes that in accordance with the conclusion of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Party History at the Belorussian CP Central Committee and the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Justice, the date of 25 March 1918 cannot be considered the day of national independence of the Belorussian people. The proclamation on that day of the Belorussian People's Republic (BNR), under conditions of German occupation, was never considered the formation of a state. This was merely an idea of bourgeois statehood, which representatives of Belorussian nationalist parties and other political streams which did not recognize Soviet rule were trying to put into effect.

On the basis of the above information, the ispolkom resolves:

1. To refuse to Citizen Poznyak Z.S., Khodyko Yu.V. and Marochkin A.A. the right to use of the squares, streets and other public places in the city for the organization on 25 March of this year of celebration of the so-called "Belorussian Independence Day," on the basis of Article 48 of the Belorussian SSR Constitution, which guarantees to the citizens of the Belorussian SSR the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, meetings, processions and demonstrations only in accordance with the interests of the people and for purposes of strengthening and developing the socialist system.
2. To warn Citizens Poznyak Z.S., Khodyko Yu.V. and Marochkin A.A. of their personal responsibility in the event they violate the present law on the procedure for holding meetings, processions and demonstrations.
3. The Internal Affairs Administration of the Minsk Gorispolkom shall ensure public order on city territory on 25 March of this year, and shall enforce the requirements of the statute on the procedure for organizing and conducting assemblies, meetings, street processions and demonstrations.
4. To request the mass information media to bring the present decision to the attention of the citizens of Minsk.

Ispolkom Chairman V.I. Mikhasev

Secretary L.N. Volodkina

20 March 1990.

Ukrainian Pogrom Rumors Answered**Ukrainian Writers' Union Secretary Responds**

90UN1039A Kiev LITERATURNIA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian No 6, 8 Feb 90 p 1

[Article by Yuriy Mushketyk, first secretary of the board of the Ukrainian Writers' Union: "Will There Be Jewish Pogroms in the Ukraine?"]

[Text] For almost two weeks the telephones have not stopped ringing in the editorial offices. People are calling from Kiev and Lvov, Vinnitsa and Chernovtsy, Zhitomir and Odessa, Kamenets-Podolskiy and Berdichev. They are engineers and doctors of science, teachers and physicians, veterans and young people. Most of them are of Jewish nationality, asking "When (note: not "will there be" but "when") should we expect Jewish pogroms in the Ukraine?" Representatives of other nationalities in the republic are also worried. They can recall the slogans of extremists, "Occupiers, Get Out!" and "Ukraine for the Ukrainians!" that were brought to mind by telecasts reporting the rally on St Sophia Square in Kiev on the occasion of the "Chain of Unity" on 21 January of this year. (Let us recall that these vile and pernicious rumors became especially active on the eve of that event.) I. Dorfman, a Vinnitsa area bookkeeper who was in St Sophia Square that day, writes in a letter to the editors: "I was very happy the way Dmytro Pavlychko, who presided over the rally, reacted so swiftly to those ominous outbursts and forced the extremists to creep away with their filthy slogans. But for how long? How much power do writers have over such a vile infection? Might it not pop up again quite suddenly in some other place?"

Because we value the reader's trust above all, and not just in order to keep the editorial telephones from overheating, we immediately turned to the Ukrainian Writers' Union. That Monday, two persons showed up "on duty": Yuriy Mushketyk, the first secretary of the board of the SPU [Ukrainian Writers' Union], and USSR People's Deputy Volodymyr Yavorivskyy, a secretary of the board of the SPU. Here is what they had to say.

We Care About Unity

Ukrainian writers are now unanimously in favor of the republic's sovereignty. We view sovereignty as applying to everyone who lives in the republic. All of us together—Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Moldavians, Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians, and representatives of other nationalities—are building our lives, dealing with the economy and ecology of our country and fostering the cultural development of each nation. We greatly value the fraternal support of people who, regardless of their nationality, promote the revival of the Ukrainian

language—without, of course, neglecting the cultural development of other peoples inhabiting our republic. Before the war, there were 468 Jewish schools in the Ukraine, 238 Polish and 168 Moldavian ones (to say nothing of Russian schools)—yet this did not hinder the cultural development of the Ukrainian people. And there is nothing that need divide us now. This is why we harshly condemn anyone who tries to foment strife among us or poison our common soil; this is why we become so indignant over rumors spread by the evil tongue-wagging of provocateurs. We've heard it said, for instance, that Ukrainians are bringing in weapons from abroad and allegedly putting them in the hands of "fighters." In fact, they have even mentioned this or that "fatal date" just in order to spread panic and fear. That will never happen! We writers and our Union live for a harmonious homeland. We share all our joys and sorrows, worries and concerns. To be sure, difficulties do arise in everyday life. But they are also shared, and we need unity to overcome them. That's what we're fighting for!

Kiev Rukh Leader Responds

90UN1039B Kiev *LITERATURA UKRAYINA*
in Ukrainian No 6, 8 Feb 90 p 1

[Article by USSR People's Deputy Volodymyr Yavorivskyy, chairman of the Kiev Regional Organization of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroika: "To Non-Ukrainians Living in the Ukrainian SSR"]

[Text] Esteemed Brothers!

Once again the shadow of alarm and foreboding broods over the land of the Ukraine. Once again, some anonymous provocateur is intensively spreading pernicious rumors of an inevitable confrontation between us, of clashes and pogroms; even the dates have been set. Once again, our unity that we worked so hard to attain is displeasing to someone. The anonymous culprit acts now in the name of the Ukrainian People's Movement, now in the name of the Ukrainian people.

We have been united by our common woes—total shortages, in particular the shortage of freedom and democracy. We have been united by Chernobyl and Chernovtsy, by smoke-blackened Zaporozhye and departmentally-conquered Kanev, by angered Chernigov. Now attempts are being made to disunite us by the same forces which brought us all these woes. Their calculations are simple: to scatter us into ethnic corners and sow distrust, fear, and doubt in our hearts. It is all being done to cast doubt upon the progress we have made—difficult but irreversible progress toward democracy, mutual understanding and, finally, a normal human life in this our land.

In my address at the Rukh Constituent Congress I said: "We stand at the brink of an abyss, and so we must take each other by the hand." There are certain ones, however, who desperately want to push us over the edge, and to do it they have to blind our eyes. But they have

forgotten that we all have a spiritual vision, the vision of people who refuse any more to be puppets or cogs in a wheel. If someone should ask me what kind of Ukraine I want, I'll answer: "A democratic and sovereign Ukraine." Probably the same thing is desired by the Russians, the Jews, Hungarians, Greeks, Belorussians, Tatars, Bulgarians, and Gagauzes who live beside us on this soil and have the Ukraine as their fatherland. We certainly cannot allow anyone to cast us once more into the darkness of pogroms, bloodshed, and fratricide instead of creating a democratic republic! And we won't! Like many other people's deputies, I was not elected just by Ukrainians alone. Hence, we will never give in to the filthy provocations of forces which are striving to shift onto us their own fear of the people, people who are annoyed, worn out, and just about at the end of their patience, people who want to live differently.

Think about it: Why have some people shamelessly called the living chain of January, which was made up of Russians, Jews, Poles, and Hungarians, "a nationalist act," while the anti-Semitic provocations of Pamyat are being assiduously promoted? In several American newspapers, someone—seemingly inadvertently—placed Rukh and Pamyat on an equal footing, and I had to try to refute it by publishing an article about it. That provocation as well is being fomented on a grand scale.

But we are all standing together now. Together we lived through the famine of 1933, the bloody horror of Stalinism. We defended our land in the war against fascism, maintained our reason and human dignity during the years of stagnation and depersonalization, and survived the Chernobyl disaster. Surely, then, we can continue to survive without losing our common sense, our human dignity, now that we have had a taste of freedom, when we are discarding years of dogma and demagoguery! I believe that among the numerous Russians, Jews, Poles, Tatars, and Hungarians—representatives of all the national minorities living in the Ukraine—there are courageous and honorable intellectuals, wise and reflective people. A great deal depends on them now. Do not just "sit and wait"; progressive forces of the Ukrainian nation want the same things you do: democratic elections to parliament (now you can see why the provocation was launched right at the start of the election campaign); decisive efforts to deal with the Chernobyl tragedy; radical political and economic changes; democratic solutions to ethnic and religious problems. We want full glasnost and social justice. And we also know that we will not be provoked! They're threatening us with knives again. But if that knife should flash, please know this: that I will confront it with my own chest—and not I alone, but millions of people in Rukh, the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Association, the Ukrainian Deputies Club. For we know that if such a thing happens, it is the end of everything, the end of the Ukraine herself, our long-suffering and yet still vital, gentle mother who cherishes all of us. So let us be wise and courageous, and united with her. By leading her away from the brink, we will escape it ourselves. And we can do it only if we take each other by the hand.

New Political Organizations Formed in Lvov

90UN1470A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 10 Apr 90 p 1

[Report by S. Romanyuk: "The Week's News"]

[Text] Lvov—Another shortage in Lvov's stores. With a political nuance on this occasion: there is a shortage of blue and yellow cloth. Many people are sewing together blue-and-yellow flags.

The session of the new city soviet adopted (with six votes against) the "Regulations Governing Use of the Ukrainian National Flag in the City of Lvov," and a few minutes later the blue-and-yellow material with trident was fluttering above Lvov's City Hall.

The democratic bloc took office. One could not force one's way through to the city soviet building when it was in session. Those assembled greeted with ovations and shouts of "Glory to the Ukraine!" their elect who were rushing off to the first working sessions. Euphoria....

But there are the first sober evaluations also. Comparing the soviet which has relinquished its authority and the new one, Bogdan Kotik, chairman of the city soviet executive committee—the sole mayor in Western Ukraine remaining in office for a second term, apparently—said that whereas earlier the soviet had been passive and dilettante, it has now become active and dilettante. Which is better, time will tell.

And, further. The mayor declared that the rumors making the rounds of the city to the effect that the democratic bloc intended dismissing all former "apparatchiks" were without foundation. Corrupt elements involved in the abuse of power and also incompetent officials would be removed from office.

Criticism of the CPSU has reached its apogee. All the worst words in the vocabulary of some speakers have already been leveled at it. A concentrated offensive against the socialist idea itself has begun. As observed at a plenum of the Lvov Komsomol [Communist Youth League] Oblast Committee, "a further growth of antisocialist sentiments, unfounded and unceremonious more often than not, what is more," is taking place. The Komsomol Oblast Committee addressed a statement to the newly elected soviets. The Komsomol called for wisdom and civil peace and advised the deputies and apparatchiks to rise above personal grievances and ambitions. In the east of the country this is what the elders do, but in the west, besides the Komsomol, there is no one, apparently....

April threatens to be the month of the birth of a multitude of political parties.

A constituent assembly has been held in Yavorovskiy Rayon which proclaimed the Ukrainian Peasant Democratic Party. It is planned holding on 21 April in Lvov the first congress of the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party. Delegates of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, from

which two political parties will emerge, evidently, have agreed to meet at the end of the month.

The Committee for the Creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces has issued a 10-point declaration. It contains instructions as to how a draftee may avoid serving in the Soviet Army. The committee does not intend bearing the responsibility for the fate of those who refuse. They will have to answer before the law themselves.

For the first time in the country, evidently, a strike committee in the countryside has been formed in the village of Khivchany in Sokalskiy Rayon. As decided by an assembly, the kolkhoz [collective farm] members removed the chairman. However, the rayon authorities refused to recognize their wishes de facto. The cows went unmilked, the calves went unfed, the tractors died in the spring fields.... The strike lasted approximately 24 hours and tilted the scales in favor of the kolkhoz members.

Pro-Lithuania Rally in Ivano-Frankovsk

90UN1673A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 3 Apr 90 p 4

[Article by RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent V. Shlyakhtych, Ivano-Frankovsk: "Contrary to the Law"]

[Text] Toward evening on Saturday an unauthorized political rally was held in Ivano-Frankovsk, in support of the enactments passed by the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania. It was organized by newly-established organizations in this city, in particular the NRU [Ukrainian Popular Movement For Perestroyka—Rukh]. The proceedings were led by certain Ukrainian SSR people's deputies and deputies to the oblast (from the city) and city soviets. Banners spelled out in advance the rally's main thrust.

The theme was further developed by some 15 speakers or so, who seemed to be trying to outdo one another in casting in a noble light the actions of Lithuania's present governmental bodies and in slandering everything that is being done by the President and Government of the USSR to normalize the situation in and around Lithuania by peaceful means.

One recalls statements made by Ukrainian SSR people's deputies: by Z. Duma, head of the oblast Memorial Society, and B. Rebryk, member of a cooperative and a UKhS [Ukrainian Helsinki Union] activist. Perhaps one reason why one remembers their statements is that people wanted very much to know how our new legislators view the process of development of political and economic autonomy on the part of the Soviet republics. In short, there was greater emphasis at this rally on how nicely the political garb tailored in Lithuania fits our Ukrainian figure.

Unfortunately there were also dubious recommendations on how the people of Ivano-Frankovsk should proceed with like aspirations, and certainly not just the people of this city. V. Vaytekauskas, a Lithuanian,

deputy to the Kalush City Soviet and employee at the Khlorvinil Production Association, called upon those present to form self-defense detachments.

There you have it! After yesterday's earnest assurances of dedication to peaceful ways of resolving the most acute problems, are they next going to be calling for people to take to the barricades?

This mass meeting was held contrary to the decision of the Ivano-Frankovsk City Soviet. City deputy public prosecutor V. Tkachenko and city police chief S. Honcharenko stated: "The initiators and organizers were warned in advance that if an unauthorized mass meeting were held in this city, measures in accordance with present laws would be taken against them. And we shall do so."

Deputies Hit for Participation in Rally

90UN1673B Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 4 Apr 90 p 3

[Article by RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent L. Yanyuk: "Through the Prism of the Law"]

[Text] The Kiev Public Prosecutor's Office has received a formal complaint of administrative violation of the law by Ukrainian SSR People's Deputy O. Shevchenko, who took active part in an unauthorized street procession and mass rally on 1 April. Similar documents should be received within three days from the time of the actions in question from internal affairs agencies for each of the organizers and active participants in the unauthorized mass meeting on 31 March of this year.

* * *

"Pursuant to the provisions of the law," stated Kiev Deputy Prosecutor S. Lotyuk, "after examining these documents, we shall forward them to the rayon people's courts, and we shall send letters to the appropriate Soviets of People's Deputies in connection with those persons charged who happen to be people's deputies."

[Reporter] According to the law, who is considered an organizer and active participant in unauthorized activities?

[Lotyuk] We consider as organizers and active participants those persons who engaged in announcing such events and who spoke at mass meetings. Unfortunately those who signed appeals to various bodies include many people's deputies, and the speakers include 10 USSR, Ukrainian SSR, and Kiev City Soviet people's deputies. Such actions cannot be called anything other than flaunting of the law. And that is putting it mildly, to say the least. Here is a document dated 29 March—a warning against violating the law. I quote: "Holding an unauthorized mass meeting on 31 March constitutes a violation of the law and, if such meeting takes place, the authorities will consider prosecuting those persons

responsible." The signature of M. Horyn, chairman of the secretariat of Rukh, appears under this warning.

The organizer of the street profession, deputy to the city soviet Yu. Perch, was warned in like manner by the Darnitskiy Rayon prosecutor's office. Incidentally, Perch stated that he would not be participating in this activity. In actual fact this turned out not to be the case....

Indeed, on 31 March and 1 April things were different from the assurances contained in an open letter to Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers Chairman V. Masol, addressing the Moskovskiy Rayon and Kiev City Soviets of People's Deputies. Actual events even differed from the statements in the leaflets issued by the organizers of these mass events. Let one person out of those 3,000 to 3,500 Kievans (this number of persons were present at the rally by the stadium, according to MVD figures) say that he heard from the speakers the slightest hint of "comprehensive discussion of the political situation." On the contrary, every last person who took the bullhorn condemned in one way or another the "tactics of gradual occupation" of Lithuania, which allegedly threatens the Ukraine as well as all other republics. What is this if not an attempt to inflame ethnic enmity? And are we supposed to take as a joke the appeal by O. Shevchenko, voiced on 1 April by the walls of the Arsenal, to establish a national Ukrainian army and to boycott the spring military induction callup?

Some readers may ask themselves (I myself have done so) how illegal actions in such cases can be stopped. I quote from Article 185 (first part) of the Administrative Code: "Breach of the public order and violation of regulations governing the organization or holding of public gatherings, rallies, street processions and demonstrations shall be punishable by a warning or fine in the amount of 300 rubles; in exceptional cases, if these measures are considered inadequate in view of the circumstances of the specific case, taking into account the person of the violator, such actions shall be punishable by administrative detention for a period of up to 15 days."

I have no intention of frightening anybody by citing this provision of the law. It is simply that the law is the law. If it has become outdated and is no longer in step with the present day, who other than people's deputies should be concerning themselves with revising the law or drafting a new law? But since the law is in effect, one would think that the first commandment of a people's deputy would be to uphold the law. Or am I wrong?

Reactions to Recent Student Strikes in Kiev

90UN1362A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 28 Feb 90 p 3

[Article by L. Kokhanets and O. Pokalchuk "Pickets at University (Several Short Interviews and Authors' Reflections on Ukrainian Student Union's Call for Republic-Wide Strike)"]

[Text] Whether or not we wanted it, the strike did not turn out to be a Republic-wide one, but in some VUZs there were deviations from the curriculum. Not everywhere the strike led to peaceful "round table" negotiations, where, pacified by mutual understanding, representatives from Party and Strike Committees together were finding common solutions. Apparently, mutual understanding at times was slipping on a shiny polished surface of the "round tables".

The Strike Committee presented the following demands: raise scholarships to the subsistence minimum, provide dormitories for all students, evict those not belonging to the students' environment and implement voluntary attendance of classes on military and medical training and physical fitness. There were also demands to make studies of Marxist-Leninist subjects optional and to annul Article 6 of the Ukrainian SSR Constitution, which frankly looked like an attempt to force an open door.

We have talked about these demands and the call itself with those concerned.

Conversation No. 1 - with the Party Secretary of the Kiev Pedagogical Institute imeni Gorky, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences G.I. Volynok.

What is your assessment of the today's event?

[Volynok] The same as of anything that detracts one from studies. And, strike or no strike, the level should have been much higher. In my opinion, the basic policy of the Ukrainian Student Union [USS] should be orientation toward high professionalism. This is what we are most painfully short of...

Do you think students have no reasons for discontent?

[Volynok] Of course they do. Scholarships are small. By the way, our dormitories are simply beautiful. It is a sin to criticize them. But I am bothered with something else - the demand to make the study of social sciences optional. I don't think this is wise. I would vote with both my hands for radical restructuring of their teaching. The teachers should give author's lectures on politology, sociology and the development of Ukrainian history. One should study Skovoroda and the development of the philosophical ideas in the Ukraine. But in no case should one eliminate a series of Marxist-Leninist lectures. It seems "The extremes are dead - long live the extremes!" The entire world studies Marxism-Leninism, but we refuse to.

I am against the strike not because of my official duties. Being an older person, I value reasonableness - it saves one from distortions and running from one extreme to another. I am not for strikes but for jointly solving our problems. Let us polemicize, but let us try to understand each other without picketers' help.

Conversation No. 2 - with a member of the USS Coordination Council, a Pedagogical Institute student Viktor Ukolov.

Why did one choose to strike at such an inappropriate moment in time? At present, elections are the No. 1 political event. They call for combined effort and united people, while you in essence are distracting our most democratic stratum from the main event, aren't you?

[Ukolov] On the contrary, we are attracting them to the main event. We cannot wait anymore for the Government to drag their feet in solving our problems. The thing is, students are not just the most democratic stratum, but also the most deprived of civil rights one.

Which demands are you expecting to be satisfied first?

[Ukolov] We need larger scholarships, dormitories and immediate deideologization of our VUZs. This is what we call attention to before the elections and by the strike itself, although our Institute's Komsomol Committee has a different opinion on the subject. It considers the strike a political provocation against the background of a complicated sociopolitical and economic situation in the Republic. But we think the Ukraine will never find a way out of this situation if the youth follows humbly in the temperate footsteps of the education management.

Conversation No. 3 - with the Secretary of the Party Committee of the Kiev State University V.I. Polokhalo.

Vladimir Ivanovich, nobody can ever count you among conservatives. What is your opinion of the strike?

[Polokhalo] The action announced by the Ukrainian Student Union Coordination Council reminds me an arithmetic operation: write 2 and store 3. I don't think the word "strike" is adequate for the events that took place on February 20 and 21 at our University or at the inter-VUZ meeting. A lot more students had participated in the boycott of the Military Training Chair, which at the time had drawn attention to our institution, and they had been much more active. Without understanding the why's and how's, dozens of people, either sympathizers or just curious people, gathered "to chat" at the Shevchenko Memorial. There were very few KSU [Kiev State University] students. By the way, not even all Departments new the strike had been announced. And those who did know were not rushing to join, because the strikers' demands were forcing an open door.

We thought so too.

[Polokhalo] All these problems had been already talked about at a students' forum, and a youth meeting on the subject took place at the CPSU Central Committee. But the subject's antiquatedness is not the point after all. The main thing is that one has already been working at our University on implementing most of the "ultimatum's" demands. We were among the first ones to eliminate the Social Sciences Institute, and we found structures that conform to the current situation.

Of course, complete restructuring of teaching of social sciences has not taken place yet. In five years teachers have changed little in the style and contents of their subjects. The most principal change - restructuring one's

one intellect, which for years had been fed dogmas, - has not occurred yet. So there really is a problem. But a boycott will not solve it. It would be nice if one could announce a strike and everything changed overnight. But in real life not all is that simple. Besides, in this case a boycott is a childish game of democracy. We have voluntary attendance. If you don't like the teacher, do not attend his or her classes. Choose a library and study on your own. Thank God, now one has enough to read outside "the plan".

I personally also doubt the sincerity of the goal of the action that was portentiously called a strike. The election struggle is going on, and one can use the situation. There was noise, but as to results... It seems the strike sponsors, members of the USS Coordination Council, did not care much about results. At least, when I talked to several Union members, they conceded, without visible regret, that it had been a "soap bubble".

You knew of the planned action ahead of time. Did one try to obstruct it using administrative measures?

[Polokhalo] One indeed did very well by not resorting to any pressure. This would only have resulted in higher "waves". By the way, both the left and the right urged us to use "decisive measures". But we believed that common sense would win. Our students are wise people.

Our common misfortune is that nobody has been forming our democratic culture skills. For a long time we had been napping in meetings, only waking up to raise our hands "aye". And now everybody has become a public activist and is yelling whatever he or she pleases."

For instance, "Down With Party Committees!"

[Polokhalo] Well, nowadays this slogan is a pure provocation. For a Party Committee to be or not to be will be decided not by a dozen of a meeting attendees, but by all VUZ's Communists. More so that we discussed this problem when the VUZ Rules were approved at a University Council meeting. We will again return to the issue in a calm situation.

But will it be calm?

[Polokhalo] I believe so. We are not scared of a multi-party system, as a SNUM [Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth] member alleged at the meeting - we are alarmed by his call to liquidate the Communist Party. There goes your freedom of choice. True, this call was not drowned in a storm of unanimous applause... Only two or three persons clapped their hands - either approvingly or curiously...

From one session to another a student lives joylessly.

[Polokhalo] To earn a diploma living on one's father's support is no picnic for a grown-up. It is even more sad for those who do not have this "means of transportation". The troubles of our times - shortages and inflation - are most painful for a very thin student's wallet, and they through its owner far below the poverty level. Is it

real to raise scholarships? Yes, it is. For instance, in the Kiev University funds have been redistributed, and now it is possible to give each student R35 a month more. Republic's other VUZs also have the wherewithal to raise scholarships. This was confirmed by a member of the Collegium of the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Higher Education [Minivuz Ukrainian SSR] V.I. Danilenko, who attended the meeting. The money is there. But the existing legislation does not contain an article that would allow the Republic to spend money independently for improving students' material conditions.

'But now the Minister is conducting negotiations with the Union Government on raising scholarships to R60-65', Comrade Danilenko "comforted" the meeting participants. Against the background of other demands - broaden the Republic's rights and economic sovereignty - which were so much talked about these days in all kinds of meetings and which raised no objections on the part of either students or teachers, the consolation reminded one a classic example of using an antonym.

To evict unrelated tenants (and there are about 30 percent of those, according to the Strike Committee data) from dormitories, one probably does not have to wait for negotiations with central authorities or for the establishment of Republic's sovereignty. Almost a year ago, a KSU student talked in the "Radyanska Ukrayina" youth column about strange rules in dormitories and even named tenants that had no relation to the University. There was a quick response to the newspaper's statement. The very next day the article author was defamed at all levels - how dared he cast aspersions at his alma mater. Of course, in the process one had forgotten to take care of the tenants problem. Apparently, one had been waiting for the Strike Committee announcements to reinforce the newspaper's statement.

A strike is always the last resort, both in the alien capitalistic and in our own socialist world. It recoils painfully in one's one shoulder. Probably we should not comfort ourselves with the fact that there was only a strike attempt. The attempt can be repeated, if hastiness of some people encounters the macrocaution of others and the ponderability of accomplishments drowns in "Down with it!" cries.

The meeting ended with an optimistic note - an understanding had been achieved between students and Minvuz Ukrainian SSR to conduct a constructive dialog. The dialog will take place as soon as possible, with broad participation of informals. God give all of us brains, so pickets never stand in front of the University. Let the University be a temple of knowledge, not a meeting room.

Report on Kiev Pro-Lithuanian Rally

90UN1778A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
3 Apr 90 p 4

[Article by M. Derimov: "In the Spirit of Confrontation: An Unsanctioned and Poorly-Attended Rukh Rally is Held in Kiev"]

[Text] "Read this and pass it on!"—a leaflet printed under such an intriguing rubric was widely disseminated in Kiev on Friday, 30 March. The text contained the appeal of the Rukh secretariat to "all those who are not indifferent to the fate of their own people" to come to the republic stadium on Saturday, 31 March for a "rally for solidarity with the heroic people of Lithuania."

Such was the response of the Rukh leadership to the previously published appeals of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee and republic government. You cannot call such a response anything other than provocative, aimed at exacerbating the confrontation! Having called, without heeding any precaution, for a rally to be held to support the illegal decisions of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet on "the restoration of the independence of the Lithuanian state," the Rukh leadership has manifested direct disrespect for the resolutions of the 3rd Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the Ukases of the USSR President, the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government. The Rukh ruling clique has obviously attempted to impell the workers of the Ukraine to a situation in which by supporting one sector of Lithuania's population, they have shown disrespect for another sector; they have attempted to heat up separatist moods, and to complicate the sociopolitical situation in our republic as well.

Yet have the rally's organizers managed to implement these far-ranging adventuristic goals?

I came to the square next to the republic stadium on 31 March at the time indicated in the leaflet. Nearby, on Red Army Street, there were many passersby on this sunny weekend day. Yet far from all of them expressed curiosity over what was happening here. Many already knew what is usually said at such rallies, and preferred to continue going about their own business. And those who remained all the same stated that there was no one but a few militia staffers in the large area between the solid group of rally participants and the fence.

Apparently, this empty space disturbed the rally organizers standing on the improvised tribune, and they tried to "salvage the honor of the uniform": referring to the personal computer of a candidate of technical sciences, they announced that 12,000 people participated in the rally. Also announced was the personal opinion of L.P. Skorik, recently elected Ukrainian SSR people's deputy, that he feels there are 50,000 people attending. There were actually no more than 500 activists of Rukh, UKhS [Ukrainian Helsinki Union], and various other informal organizations standing near the tribune, and a bit further away were 2,000-3,000 passersby debating what was happening in animated tones, not particularly listening to what the speakers were saying. I subsequently found full confirmation of these impressions of mine in the data at the city UVD [internal affairs administration]: According to militia estimates, from 3,000 to 3,500 people attended the rally. It may be confidently asserted that the Kievans did not respond to the provocative appeal of the Rukh secretariat.

And, as always in such cases, there were more than enough yellow-and-light blue flags. There were red-and-black Banderist flags. Incidentally, while 6 months ago, at a similar (although better attended) rally in this same square the leaders had barely managed to order the unfurling of the black-and-red standards, then now, the USSR and Ukrainian SSR people's deputies standing on the tribune seemed not even to notice the banner of Stepan Bandera, cursed by the people. Right out with it, what is there to hide here! Lately, direct ties, including financial ones as well, between certain UKhS-Rukh activists and the sponsors of the OUN [Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists] abroad have become, as they say, the property of glasnost!

The slogans on the banners display at the republic stadium last Saturday seem also more militant, instigating. Here were hysterical wails such as "Down with the empire," "Tremble, empire!" and texts in which young draftees were incited to decline to fulfill their military duty.

As far as the speakers were concerned, one can only exclaim here, all the same old faces! And the same old speeches, too!

Deputies M. Goryn, I. Drach, D. Pavlychko, L. Tanyuk, and others vied to demonstrate disrespect for the decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the ukases of the president, and for the resolutions of the union and republic governments. UKhS Chairman L. Lukyanenko, trotting out his usual line, appealed for the Ukraine to follow Lithuania's example and secede from the Union of SSRs. A certain representative of SNUM [Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth] from Lvov attempted to deny our party's right to exist and threatened strikes. And UKhS member O. Shevchenko, recently elected Ukrainian SSR people's deputy, requested that they come with banners on the opening day of the republic Supreme Soviet session in order than he and those like him not feel lonely there...

In conclusion, it remains to be said that having ignored all insistent appeals not to interfere with the highest organs of power finding a way out of the political crisis that has arisen in the Lithuanian SSR, the Rukh leaders have manifested legal nihilism, and a lamentable lack of legal culture. And if you consider that these Rukh leaders are simultaneously people's deputies as well, then you involuntarily think, how are they going to serve the interests of their electorate, the workers of various regions of the republic? I am convinced that the voters have not granted them such empowerment, to not obey the laws and to reject presidential ukases.

From the editors: As this issue was being composed, we got in touch with PRAVDA UKRAINY staff correspondents in oblasts of the republic and asked them to inform us of how local divisions of Rukh and other informal organizations were reacting to the Rukh leadership statement on the political crisis in the Lithuanian SSR. Data received at the moment the newspaper was being signed

to press bear evidence that in many locations, the appeal to hold confrontation rallies on the past weekend days has not been supported by Rukh advocates.

While in Lvov and Ternopol, 15,000-20,000 people and 8,000 people gathered at such rallies respectively, and at the analogous undertaking arranged by the regional Rukh organization in Kharkov, there were only about 2,000. In Donetsk, up to 200; in Vinnitsa, about 200-250. In Chernovtsy, the leadership of the regional Rukh division refused to participate in the rallies, and only a few dozen local UKhS members attempted unsuccessfully to hold them. There were no rallies in Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporozhye, Kherson, Odessa, Simferopol, Cherkassy, Chernigov, or Uzhgorod.

Ukrainian Youth Protest Military Service

90UN1728A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 10 Apr 90 p 3

[Article by RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent B. Sinkevych, Ternopol: "Who Will Arrange the Accents?"]

[Text] "No-man's-land" or "liberty square," as the unofficial ["informal"] organizations have recently been calling the well-known plaza in Ternopol between Theater Square and the department store, was occupied for 24 hours the other day by members of the Ternopol organizations of SNUM [Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth].

The Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth takes an openly anti-Communist position. Its organization in the oblast center numbers, to quote its regional leader, Yuriy Morhun ("If this is of interest to you"), "approximately five persons." And there are an additional supposedly 20 persons in initiative groups in Borshchev, Berezhany, Lanovtsy, and Chortkov....

Some of them—college students, vocational-school and secondary-school students—brought air mattresses and sleeping bags to the plaza in order to sleep right there, on benches, following their "watch" and, if one is to believe the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth leadership, following a "hunger strike chain across the Ukraine." For what purpose? On a poster hanging from the neck of organization activist Oksana Nazarko we read: "We demand that it be prohibited to use troops against the civilian population."

This political action began in Lvov, and 24 hours later it was picked up in Ternopol like a relay baton, from which it "traveled" to Ivano-Frankovsk and other oblast centers where Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth and SUM [Union of Ukrainian Youth] organizations exist.

Frankly, the hunger strike by these unofficial organizations was a novelty for the people of Ternopol, and for this reason people walked up to the "protesters" out of curiosity, to ask them for what cause they were enduring hunger, whereupon they would receive an exhaustive

explanation: "For the elimination of political sections in the Armed Forces, for deideologization of the military, and for the establishment of republic military units in the Ukraine." None of the onlookers, however, was able to persuade the protesters that their hunger strike was wrong. One woman came up, a teacher to judge from her appearance and manner. She exclaimed angrily: "The slogans displayed on this plaza are wrong, and should be removed," turned on her heel, and marched off. Nor did Gen V.O. Malyovannyy, former chief of the oblast executive committee MVD directorate, also visited the scene. Vasyl Onysymovych also expressed his dissatisfaction over the actions of the members of SNUM. But the latter complained, as if in self-justification, that so many pictures had allegedly been taken of them, especially from the windows of the nearby Hotel Ukrayina, that they could paper the walls of all offices in the KGB and MVD, and yet not one party or soviet official had shown up. Of course they have a point.

Particularly since there was to be another such event in Ternopol, in order, as the participants explained, to complete the campaign on the eve of the spring military draft call. In short, on the day before the scheduled induction, members of SNUM are demonstrating against Ukrainian young men serving in the Soviet Army which they, the members of SNUM, consider to be an army of "occupation".... We hope that officials will see fit to enter into a public debate and express their position on the matter.

They should also explain to these young people that there are certain sacred things which one is not allowed to trample on, even young people who are unaware of all the details of the difficult, painful history of the Ukrainian people. Playing with pseudodemocracy and extreme chauvinistic patriotism is always very dangerous.

Ukrainian Rayon Committee Participant in Language Society, 'Green World'

90UN1197B Kiev LITERATURNIA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian No 9, 1 Mar 90 p 4

[Interview with V.I. Drobotun, first secretary of the Moskovskiy Rayon party committee, Kiev, by LITERATURNIA UKRAINA reporter Volodymyr Tatarenko: "Unofficial Organizations... In Rayon Committee"]

[Text] In an article entitled "Festival of Our National Language," which appeared in Issue No 2 of LITERATURNIA UKRAYINA, 11 January 1990, we informed our readers about the establishment of a primary organization of the Ukrainian Language Society imeni Taras Shevchenko among administrative employees of the Moskovskiy Rayon Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party in Kiev. We recently learned that the Moskovskiy Rayon Party Committee has also become a group member of the Green World Association.

Our reporter asked V.I. Drobotun, first secretary of the Moskovskiy Rayon party committee, Kiev, to comment on this.

* * *

[Drobotun] In the course of the last two years the rayon committee has very diligently addressed environmental issues. The fact is that Moskovskiy Rayon is one of the worst rayons in Kiev as regards pollution levels. There are several enterprises situated in our rayon which rather appreciably contribute to degradation of the environment. They include the Chervonnyy Humovyk Production Association, a decorative glass plant, Refrigerated Warehouse Combine No 2, and the Furniture Factory imeni V. N. Bozhenko. But motor vehicle exhaust represents the most serious source of pollution. Traffic arteries of importance to the entire city as well as the republic pass through our rayon, such as the Prospekt 40-richchya Zhovtnya [40th anniversary of October Boulevard], Vasylykivska, Chervonoarmiyska, and Gorkiy streets.... These streets carry heavy vehicle traffic, particularly buses, for the most part Ikarus buses, which are notorious polluters. In addition, the number of privately-owned cars is steadily growing....

Many people who live and work in this rayon, including members of the scientific intelligentsia (10 institutes of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and 20 branch scientific research institutes are located in Moskovskiy Rayon), who are sincerely concerned about the state of the environment, have been working effectively for quite some time now within the Green World Association. That is, they and we are of like mind, and therefore we should work jointly. Consequently, inasmuch as the draft bylaws of the Green World Association provide for group membership in addition to individual membership, we decided to take advantage of this provision and, establishing a Green World primary organization within the rayon committee administrative apparatus, to become a member of the association. This idea was formally proposed and approved by us at the end of last summer. And in September the Greens Council officially accepted the Moskovskiy Rayon Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Kiev, into the Green World Association.

[Tatarenko] Have there been to date any specific results in improving the environment in this rayon?

[Drobotun] It would be incorrect to state that there has been a substantial environmental improvement in the rayon. But we do have positive results from joint efforts on the part of the party rayon committee, the rayon executive committee, and the "Greens." For example, two polluting production processes have been shut down at the Furniture Factory imeni V. N. Bozhenko. Through joint efforts we have succeeded in successfully pushing through the best plan (of several existing plans) for renovation of Moscow Square, which will make it possible substantially to improve air quality around the square. Construction crews have already started work on

this project. We have jointly conducted several expert studies in the area of the bus terminal construction site at the Teremki-2 housing complex, where the air pollution index already exceeds allowable limits. But we are urging the conduct of an independent environmental study. Working together with the public and with the participation of USSR People's Deputy S. M. Ryabchenko, we have proposed an alternative bus terminal construction plan—at another location. Thanks to our joint efforts, the decision has been made to halt construction of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Surface Chemistry in the Feofaniya. We intend to convert those facilities already constructed into a sports and recreation center. We are working together with the Committee to Protect the Holosiyivskyy Woods, which is also a member of the Green World Association, on getting the Holosiyivskyy Woods to be designated a protected site. And recently we formed a committee to save the Lybed, a stream with which the history not only of the Ukrainian people but of other Slavic peoples as well is connected.

Ukrainian SSR: Removal of Oblast Leaders Demanded

90UN1412A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
8 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by staff correspondent N. Baras: "Pickets Outside the Obkom Building"]

[Text] Vinnitsa—The hunger strike undertaken by members of informal associations continued for nearly 60 hours in front of the Vinnitsa Party Obkom Building. Late in the evening of 5 March its participants separated and left for their individual homes.

Just how did events develop?

On 3 March at 12:00 noon several people unfurled banners with the inscription "Political Hunger Strike" in front of the party obkom building, set up a board containing the demands they were making of the oblast and city authorities, and announced the beginning of a hunger strike. These people (a former employee of the oblast procurator's office, a woman retiree, and workers at Vinnitsa enterprises) were quite familiar to Vinnitsa's residents. They are all representatives of the informal associations that are currently gathering strength, and invariable participants in recent unsanctioned and sanctioned rallies.

"We have been forced to take such actions," said V. M. Paliy, one of the hunger strike's initiators, "not so much by personal offenses as by the unwillingness of the authorities, especially the party obkom, to listen to the demands of the people."

What sort of demands did he mean? Immediate action on resolutions adopted by two citywide rallies held in February, which had demanded the immediate resignation of the party obkom buro, the withdrawal of all

administrative penalties previously imposed on members of informal organizations, and the retraction of recent broadcasts by the oblast radio station and articles in the newspaper VINNITSKA PRAVDA, as well as the lodging of criminal charges against persons who had allegedly impeded election campaigning on 1 March.

It should be noted that, from every indication, it was precisely the latter incident, which took place outside the party obkom building, during which the militia arrested several members of informal organizations "for the attempt to organize an unsanctioned rally and picket the obkom," that provided the formal occasion for initiating the hunger strike.

On 4 March, when Vinnitsa residents were headed for their election precincts, the hunger strikers made additional demands—that yet another set of criminal charges be lodged, and also that the members of the party obkom buro, the chief of the oblast ispolkom's internal affairs administration, and the oblast procurator immediately "come out to the people." By that time, the participants in the hunger strike had been joined by sympathizers and a support group that was gathering signatures in defense of their "action."

In the middle of the day I. I. Soroka, first secretary of the Vinnitsa Party Gorkom, tried to initiate a dialogue with the hunger strikers and, on behalf of the obkom buro, invited them to talks. However, they stood their ground: the oblast's party leaders should come out to the people.

"No one intended to sit and wait in their offices," said G. Ya. Burtyak, secretary of the party obkom, explaining the buro's position. "But this was a matter of election day, on which all rallies are prohibited by law. And we could not commit a violation of the law."

The main events took place on the following day, the morning of 5 March, when a dialogue began between participants in the hunger strike and members of the party obkom buro. Unfortunately, neither side would agree to a compromise. And then the correspondents of republic newspapers accredited in Vinnitsa entered into the talks as intermediaries.

The dialogue continued, with interruptions, for about three hours and ended with buro members and the executives of law-enforcement agencies holding a discussion with the Vinnitsa residents who had gathered outside the obkom building. Both sides reached a compromise: the participants in informal associations would withdraw their demand for the immediate resignation of the obkom buro and stop their hunger strike, and the oblast leaders would immediately consider the rest of the demands.

And so, the conflict can be considered over. But Vinnitsa residents are asking a good many questions in connection with it. Just how and why did all this happen? Are the "informals" really to blame for everything? Of course, an ultimatum is not the best means of settling differences, but could the cause also lie in the authorities'

inability and unwillingness to talk with the informal associations' representatives as equals? At the least, many people in Vinnitsa agree that the oblast and city leaders did not show sufficient flexibility in time.

Ukrainian Language Instruction on TV

90UN1547A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
22 Mar 90 p 3

[Interview with Tamara Mefodiyevna Khrushch, deputy chief editor at the Ukrainian TV Chief Editorial Office for Scientific-Popular and Academic Programs, by T. Mayboroda: "Presenting a New TV Program: 'Let's Speak Ukrainian'"; date and place not given]

[Text] This new program from Ukrainian TV was first aired yesterday, 21 March at 20:45.

At the request of our correspondent, T.M. Khrushch, deputy chief editor at the Ukrainian TV Chief Editorial Office for Scientific-Popular and Academic Programs, will make a brief announcement on the program.

[Mayboroda] Tamara Mefodiyevna, how was the idea for this program born?

[Khrushch] It arose during the discussion period for the Law on Languages. In those days all the mass information media were getting hundreds, thousands of letters with specific desires and proposals. We in television were also getting them every day. Many viewers even then were asking us to organize a kind of tele-course on study of the Ukrainian language.

The Tovaristvo ukrainskoi movi im. T.G. Shevchenko also appealed to Ukrainian Television [UT] with a similar request

The main difficulty we had in creating the new program lay in the fact that we did not know to whom to address it. You see, other instructional programs which have been on the air for a long time, have a definite audience (with respect to age, and with a certain level of preparation).

Here, after taking counsel with linguistic scholars, we finally decided to orient on those who already have a minimal language base (and such people, according to our assumptions, are in the majority in the republic), but by virtue of certain circumstances had either not developed or had lost their previously-acquired knowledge.

[Mayboroda] What form did you choose for the tele-lessons?

[Khrushch] After considerable discussion, we agreed on the fact that the most acceptable form to the viewers would be a stage-play program with the same leading actors. The role of the latter, in our view, is quite significant: the success of the broadcast depends largely on their attractiveness. And that is why our choice fell on

two young, likable TV announcers, Yelena Kosyachenko and Viktor Vlasenko (Today they have the highest rating [reyting] on UT).

And so, the leaders of the program, as they are called, introduce the viewer to the topic (for example, "Acquaintance"), and the actors play it out.

There will be sketch called a "Museum of Mistakes" on the program, familiarization with reference materials, and a great deal more.

[Mayboroda] And how long will such a "lesson" be, and how often will it go on the air?

[Khrushch] The program is timed at 20 minutes. Each new "lesson" goes on the air for now once every two weeks, but then it will be transmitted three times, on various days of the week, and at a time convenient for various categories of viewers.

The premier was held on Wednesday, 21 March, at 20:45. Subsequent airings of the program are planed on Tuesday evenings, with a repeat showing on Wednesday morning, and a week later on Thursday at an earlier evening time, sometime between 16:00 and 17:00.

It goes without saying, that the fate of the program will largely be decided by viewer reaction.

Crimean Tatar Cultural Organization Formed

90UN1412B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
8 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by L. Ryabchikov: "National Center"]

[Text] A coordinating center for the revival of Crimean Tatar culture and science has been established in Simferopol.

"More than 60,000 Tatars presently live in the Crimea," said Ismet Zaatov, chairman of the new public organization's board. "Their number will grow; after all, a state program for returning people of our nationality to their native land is currently being carried out. The center, in collaboration with state agencies, is intended to create the conditions for the Crimean Tatar population to satisfy their spiritual needs. A learned council has been formed that will begin to select talented young people from among school graduates to study in the country's higher schools. And to select the most gifted young specialists to attend graduate school."

A historical research section has been set up to eliminate the "blank spots" in the history of the people, which was illegally deported during the times of Stalinism. There is also a methods council on public education, under whose guidance textbooks are being published in the indigenous language for national schools and kindergartens. The Crimean Tatar theater is being revived.

The center's plans include holding cultural festivals, organizing exhibits of artists' works, and reviving traditional crafts.

New Form of Procuracy Oversight Analyzed

90UN1385A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA
ZAKONNOST in Russian No 1, Jan 90 (signed to press
24 Jan 90) pp 14-18

[Interview with Vladimir Ivanovich Andreyev by correspondent N. Mikhno: "The New Quality of Procuracy Oversight"; date and place not given]

[Text] On 10 July 1989 the USSR Supreme Soviet approved the collegium of the USSR Procuracy. Its membership includes seven Deputy USSR Procurators. Responsibilities have been divided among the administrators of the central apparat: each procuracy oversight branch has its curator. The editors of this magazine plan to arrange interviews with them, in which they would describe how procuracy oversight will be restructured in this or that sector. Our correspondent held the first such conversation with Vladimir Ivanovich Andreyev, who supervises General Oversight.

[Correspondent] Vladimir Ivanovich, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Resolution of 6 February 1989 confirmed the structure of the USSR Procuracy. In the stead of the General Oversight Administration the resolution stipulates setting up four administrations: for oversight of execution of laws on economic activity; for oversight of execution of environmental protection legislation; for oversight of observance of the law in protecting the rights of citizens in the social sphere; and for oversight of execution of laws on violations of administrative law. Does such a reorganization not strike you as erosion of the very concept of such an important branch of procurator oversight as general oversight?

[Andreyev] Practical realization of the resolutions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on increasing the role of procuracy oversight over observing the law in conditions of forming a socialist rule-of-law state demanded serious functional and structural perestroika of the procuracy apparats. I do not believe that the reasons for which perestroika began with the central apparat require any special explanation. Article 48 of the Law on the USSR Procuracy hands over this question to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for resolution. Only after this can the USSR General Procuracy change the structure of lower-ranking procuracy organs.

The changes introduced to the structure of the central apparatus concern not only the former general oversight administration. And it would not be correct to view these as merely changing the signs which hang over the administration and the departments. The new structure is a reflection of a new concept of the role and position of procuracy oversight at the contemporary stage of perestroika, and a new evaluation of procuracy activity from the point of view of its substance, forms and means of influence over strengthening legality.

I suppose it would be appropriate to take a brief historical excursion in order to properly understand the processes now taking place in this important sector of procuracy activity.

The term "general oversight" first appeared in Soviet legislation in 1936. The Resolution of the USSR Soviet of People's Commissars, "On the Structure of the USSR Procuracy," stipulated a General Oversight Department in the make-up of the USSR Procuracy apparat; although it had already been allotted to the procuracy oversight branch by the 1922 Statute on Procuracy Oversight, which called for oversight of "the legality of the actions of all organs of power, economic institutions, social and private organizations and private individuals, by means of instituting criminal proceedings against the guilty and presenting appeals for those resolutions which violate the law."

As we see, the expression "general oversight" arose as the designation of a structural subdivision, and not as a sector of procuracy activity. With respect to the title of the department, which was largely arbitrary, it subsequently came to be called a branch of procuracy activity as well, while at the same time the word "general" pertained largely to the objects of the oversight.

It was only in 1979 that the term "general oversight" received its second meaning, that of reinforcing the law. However, in Article 3 and in the title of the first chapter of part three of the Law on the USSR Procuracy, the words "general oversight" are placed in parentheses, and are prefaced with a more correct definition: "oversight of the execution of the laws by organs of state administration; by enterprises, institutions and organizations; and by responsible officials and citizens." Subsequently the legislation used this term as a provisional and operative term.

But was "general oversight" the exclusive prerogative of a specific directorate of the USSR Procuracy? Of course not. We know that the tasks recorded in Article 22 of the Law on the USSR Procuracy, are to a significant degree resolved by the subdivisions which organize oversight over execution of the laws in transportation, at enterprises of the defense complex, and laws on juveniles and youth.

The creation of four new subdivisions on the basis of the general oversight administration hardly signifies liquidation of a most important sector of procuracy activity. Its legal base and the principal aspects of its methodological character remain. But it must be made crystal clear that all activity, and this fully applies to the work of procurators in carrying out higher oversight of the execution of laws, must be specific and purposeful. Only then will it provide genuine results.

The new structural changes in the central apparat are pursuing just such a goal. The situation that has taken shape in the nation's economy require decisively strengthening procuracy oversight of observance of the law in economic activity, and especially in connection

with the adoption of the laws on state enterprises (association), cooperation and individual labor activity. On the one hand, we must focus attention on strict observance by ministries and departments of the provisions of the laws on granting economic independence and initiative to working collectives, and to introduction of cost accounting and development of democracy in production; and on the other, on undeviating observance of state discipline, the struggle with mismanagement and waste, and displays of group egoism.

The question of intensifying the struggle with economic lawbreaking was recently examined at a session of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy; the examination revealed the exceptionally critical nature of this problem. The hopes of many economic administrators, and not only theirs, that the new economic relationships will almost "automatically" eliminate the traditional law violations in the economy, turned out to be unfounded. Restructuring economic activity in a number of branches has been accompanied by a weakening of the law-enforcement mechanism and lessening of state and departmental supervision. Scandalous manifestations of mismanagement, waste and irresponsibility, right down to outright sabotage, and the spread of crimes of avarice, are promoting the creation of unprecedented social tensions in society. We are now taking extreme measures to strengthen the procedures for legality in the economy. And the newly-created administration must be the organizer of this work.

In essence, the entire social sphere, and especially trade and domestic services, are found to be unsupported by procuracy oversight; although it is precisely here that law violation is widespread, and the rights and legal interests of the citizens are encroached upon most of all.

The party and government's broad-scale measures to restore the health of the ecological situation and protect the environment must be backed up by procuracy oversight, for which a system of environmental protection procuracies is needed. In these and other socio-economic sectors it is important to provide strict oversight of the legality of legal documents issued by administrative organs and responsible officials, and to react in a timely fashion to violations committed here.

At the present time about 30 organs have the right to take administrative sanctions. According to incomplete information almost 80 million people are subject to administrative liability every year. At the same time violation of the law is pandemic, and preventive work has been neglected, which has a detrimental effect on the state of crime and law-violation in the country. The given problem requires solution, and this must involve the means of procuracy oversight.

And this is why I cannot agree with the opinion on the fact that the establishment of the new administrations

was, purportedly, an unimportant and unnecessary decision. This measure was brought about by objective existing socio-economic and political-legal preconditions.

[Correspondent] But if you slice an apple into four parts, each of them will still be only part of an apple, and not something different...

[Andreyev] The procuracy is a complex organism, which in turn includes as an integral part the unified system of the state apparatus, which carries out specific, responsible functions. Therefore, changing its structure must be taken as a purely mechanical procedure—dividing up, consolidating, and so on.

It is a question of the structure of the apparatus promoting to the maximum degree the realization of oversight authority in the economic, social, environmental-protection and other spheres. We believe it is extremely important that while organizational restructuring is going on, we do not lose what was positive in our previous work; that the vital ties with subordinate procuracies are not severed. The newly-formed administration is being organized in such a way that its backbone will consist of officials of the former general oversight administration, who are distinguished by their professionalism, enterprise, and creative attitude toward the cause.

[Correspondent] If I may continue the analogy of the apple, it seems that in forming the four new administrations we no longer have the single former administration of general oversight. After all, judging from their titles, not one of them will engage in, for example, oversight of the observance of legality in the activity of joint enterprises, since the Law on the State Enterprise does not apply to the latter; nor of the activity of various social organization, including unofficial ones. Finally, entire territories will fall out—future zones of free enterprise. In other words, one can observe that "blank spots" have been formed, free of procuracy oversight.

[Andreyev] If, as we were "making up" the four new administrations we had arrived at the previous general oversight administration, then there would have been no sense in conducting a reorganization. The entire matter lies precisely in the fact that these administrations must take on a new quality, which the previous administration did not have.

The titles of the new administrations, naturally, cannot reflect fully the entire range of questions with which they will deal. Specifically, concerning oversight of legality in the activities of joint enterprises, the administration for oversight of carrying out laws in economic activity has a department for oversight of observing the law in industry, construction and foreign-economic activities, which will organize this work as well.

Drafting of statutes on the new administrations is now being completed. We are striving to ensure that there will be no "blank spots" in oversight, and that there will be

no grounds for their formation in the future. Also groundless are the dangers of entire territories "falling out," as you put it, from the sphere of oversight. If free economic zones or similar zones are organized, that will lead to their exclusion from the jurisdiction of the Soviet state. And procuracy organs will ensure that all organizations, responsible officials and citizens will observe the legal procedures established by the laws and by international agreements for such territories.

[Correspondent] How do things stand with respect to drawing up a new conception of general oversight? What kind of orders from the USSR Procurator General will be issued on this matter, and how many?

[Andreyev] It would probably be better to speak first of the conception of procuracy oversight as whole. At the same time one must not forget that both practitioners and scholars must work it out together, relying on a Leninist understanding of procuracy oversight, taking into consideration the state-legal and political realities of the present day. In consideration of the requirements of the new Law on Constitutional Oversight, it is necessary to define as completely as possible the limits of procuracy oversight with respect to those subject to state authority and administration. The role of organs of people's and departmental control in conditions of decentralization of the administration of the economy, and the development of cost-accounting and leasing relationships, should also be clarified. The question of the delimitation of jurisdiction of the USSR and union republics in the sphere of ensuring legality and order also requires in-depth analysis and the proper constitutional support. But in any case, there remain the principal statutes, a retreat from which would signify losing the constitutional authority of the procuracy as an organ of highest oversight for universal, precise and uniform execution of the laws. Lenin's requirement for strict centralization of procuracy organs and the independence of procurators of any local organs and responsible officials whatsoever, must be applied to these provisions.

As concerns the forms and number of documents in which the conceptual provisions will be recorded, that is a secondary question. The main thing is that we have our own position and that we can consolidate the entire procuracy system, overcoming the lack of faith in our own capabilities which has been noted in a number of places, the confusion, and attempts to conceal by demagogic arguments the inability and inhibitions in our complex conditions to steadfastly hew to a policy of supremacy of the law.

[Correspondent] But what will happen with general oversight in the procuracies of union republics, ASSR's, krays and oblasts? Are there plans to change the staff structure of the procuracies?

[Andreyev] As I've already said, the direction of the actions of procuracy organs designated "general oversight" not only will not be eliminated, but, I would hope, they will in the future acquire more specific substance as they develop.

As concerns developing the structure of the apparatus of republic, kray and oblast procuracies, such work has already begun. At the same time no task has been set to completely duplicate the structure of the USSR Procuracy. It is completely obvious that the corresponding subdivisions in various procuracies can not be identical (neither in terms of numbers nor structure): such as, for example in the RSFSR and in Estonia; or in Sverdlovsk, and Tambov Oblasts.

The structural perestroyka of the apparatus of lower-ranking procuracies must set up the organizational preconditions for intensifying oversight in priority sectors for strengthening legality. In every situation, the question of setting up independent branch departments (administrations) or of assigning these sectors to the procurators within the departments or administrations, must be resolved in consideration of the specific economic, social, demographic, national and other peculiarities of the region.

[Correspondent] Under the new structure will the number of general oversight personnel in the central apparatus remain the same, or will it increase? What will the situation be in subordinate procuracies in this respect?

[Andreyev] The total number of officials in the four new administrations will exceed the number in the former, general oversight administration. Competent authorities have recently resolved the question of allocating additional authorized staff for the union republic, kray, oblast, rayon and city procuracies who will be employed at strengthening general oversight. We understand that practical solution of the problems facing the procuracy depends largely upon the level of work of the basic units—the city and rayon procuracies. There are several aspects here: the scientifically-based staff authorization, the proper organization of their work, and their level of material-technical supply.

[Correspondent] It's hard to say how scientific such a division of general oversight is, inasmuch as along with the "blank spots" there will also be duplication in the work of certain administrations. Let's just take administrative law-violations. A great many are committed, for example in the law-application activity of the environmental protection organs and their responsible officials. The question arises, which administration should deal with this: the one for oversight of carrying out environmental protection laws or the one for oversight of execution of laws on administrative law violations? And you see, such disconnections are not unique.

[Andreyev] In my view duplication of effort occurs much more often not because of poor staff structure, but because of improper organization, and poor interaction among the various subdivisions. In every problem one can always single out the main thing, and can separate it from the secondary one. It is completely obvious that the very deliniation of the economic, social, environmental-protection and administrative spheres is to a certain

extent arbitrary, and they are distinguished by the quality of interpenetration and mutual support. But nevertheless these are independent areas of social life, which have been rather precisely formulated both in the scientific sense and in the public consciousness; and for us, the jurists the question of legal regulation of the relationships formed among them is of considerable importance. And this criterion will be the decisive one.

To a certain extent your question contains remnants of the old way of thinking—the desire to erect a departmental wall as soon as possible, and to divide “one’s own” off from the “alien.” At the same time it is desirable that “one’s own” problems are fewer. We shall not be starting from this. The following approach seems more productive to me: If there is a problem, it must be solved; and everyone must determine the form of one’s personal participation in it.

[Correspondent] Following up the preceding question, I would like to ask, Vladimir Ivanovich, how in general the interaction in the work of all four administration will occur? In any ministry, agency, or enterprise there are questions which fall under the jurisdiction of several of these administrations. And so, will their officials conduct inspections separately, or all together?

[Andreyev] Here it is hard to answer yes or no. If it is a question of inspecting in some kind of relatively limited range of questions, there should be one decision. But if an inspection is complicated and of a complex nature and touches upon important problems, then until lately it would not be conducted by a single procurator, but a group of officials would be formed, specialists recruited, and a program drawn up with personal assignments made for the inspection.

The main thing, I repeat, is in the level of organization of the work, and the assurance of the proper interaction. I have to say that by order of the USSR General Procurator, questions of all four newly-created administrations were assigned to one of his deputies. This also precludes duplication, and will prevent attempts of withdrawal from solution of problems, or of transferring them to other subdivisions. In the lower-ranking procuracies too we recommend dividing responsibilities among administrators in a similar manner.

[Correspondent] At a recent general party meeting the chief of the administration for oversight of observance of legality and protecting the rights of citizens in the social sphere, A. Khvalin, sounded what was in my view well-founded alarm, that this administration is supposed to carry out almost the very same volume of work in examining complaints and statements from citizens as the former general oversight administration, only there only half as many workers now. Can you find a word of consolation for Aleksandr Mikhaylovich in this situation?

[Andreyev] The question of complaints is truly acute. Every year the procuracy organs in the line of general

oversight alone resolve more than a half-million complaints. This is a great deal of work. But it also testifies to a great deal of faith in us. One must not forget that every tenth complaint is determined to be well-founded, and procurators take measures to defend the citizens’ violated rights.

As far as Khvalin’s fears are concerned, after all the administrators are brought up to strength, we will once again thoroughly analyze the workload, including work on complaints, and we shall take measures to set things right.

[Correspondent] It is well-known that the USSR Procuracy receives information from the entire country on how the laws are being carried out. From this, if one wishes, it is not hard to determine how “good” they are, how the “work,” and which laws we need on the basis of real-life situations. Has the USSR General Procuracy employed its right of legislative initiative in this regard?

[Andreyev] The formation of a socialist rule-of-law state, and this is determined by party and state decisions, presupposes fundamental reform of the entire system of law-giving. The USSR Procuracy is taking most active participation in this work, the forms of which vary widely. USSR General Procurator A. Sukharev is a member of the Constitutional Commission organized by the first Congress of USSR Deputies, the task of which is to draft the new text of the Fundamental Law of our state.

It would be hard to name just one more or less important law adopted in recent times or being developed now, in which our officials were not invited to participate. We have established businesslike relationships with all committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its houses; a special working group has been formed for this, and we become involved, as a rule, from the stage of formulating the concept of the new law. Our opinion is usually heeded; for after all, practical procuracy experience is an extremely sensitive barometer, which reacts to all omissions and disruptions in the legal system. From the laws adopted I would cite first of all the laws on the State Enterprise (Association) and on Cooperation; of those being worked up, the laws on conscience, on pension support, on the fundamentals of criminal and criminal-procedure legislation, and others.

I believe that in the future the USSR Procuracy will make broader use of the right to legislative initiative. But here a great deal depends upon the quality of all our work, and the reorganization of the central apparatus is directed precisely at that.

[Correspondent] And one last question. How would you define those new qualitative aspects which procuracy oversight must assume in order to fully comply with your mission at a very complex historical stage of our society?

[Andreyev] This is not an easy question and could be the topic of a separate conversation. In my view, procuracy oversight must become a more open system, and not be

hemmed-in within boundaries that were shaped in another time; it must be more "sensitive" to react rapidly to the problems and difficulties that beset our society. For example, for several decades procurators' reports contained a passage about oversight of observing the laws on kolkhoz democracy. But does democracy really begin and end with the kolkhoz? We have stood idly by, watching, while many democratic institutions established by law, while perhaps imperfect ones, were universally ignored. Administrative tyranny has become one of the main obstacles to the realization of the rights of the Soviet people, and to the solution of economic and ecological problems.

Protection of the natural environment is just such a nationwide problem, to which procuracy reaction should be the most severe and most principled. Everyone is aware of the problems of the Volga, the Aral and the Caspian Sea, Baykal, and many cities, in which life has become simply dangerous. At present the system of environmental protection procuracies and the new administration at the central apparat must become the organizers of all this exceptionally important work. In some places here we have even been too late, and we must make up for the neglect.

During the recent visit to the USSR by US Attorney General Richard Thornberg, questions of using legal means in the battle with ecological law-breaking occupied an important part of the talks between the leaders of the USSR Procuracy and the American delegation. The problem has become a global one, and the actions of the procuracy must be adequate to the danger which threatens the people. The power of the law, and the possibilities for international cooperation must all be directed toward erecting a barricade against barbarian attitudes toward nature.

Procuracy oversight, in my view, must decisively reject stereotypes in reaction to instances of violation of the rights and legal interests of the citizens. We cannot limit ourselves to restoring legality alone. In each case we must find the root cause of the situation that made it necessary for the procuracy to become involved. And we must act appropriately, whether this is a shortcoming of legal regulation, or a display of formalism and heartlessness by responsible officials.

Only a person with great civic courage can be a procurator in the full sense of the word. Quite often the lack of these very qualities leads to "pastel tints" in documents, to compromise in resolving questions of the responsibility of the accused for violating the law. Hypocrisy and half-measures are inappropriate to the socio-political situation, and to the mood of the people.

COPYRIGHT: "Sotsialisticheskaya zakonnost", 1990.

Chairman of USSR Lawyers' Union Details Activities

90UN1353A Moscow CHELOVEK I ZAKON
in Russian No 2, Feb 90, pp 74-80

[Interview with A.A. Trebkov, chairman of the USSR Lawyers' Union: "The Lawyers' Union: The Time for Coming Into Being"; date and place not given]

[Text] The USSR Lawyers' Union was created last June at a Lawyers' Inaugural Congress. This new social organization has aroused great interest, and not only among the professionals—to which the many letters from our readers testify. What will the Union's activities contribute to building a rule-of-law state, and what will it bring to lawyers and society? That is how one might summarize the majority of the questions received in the mail, and the editors have asked USSR Lawyers' Union Chairman A.A. Trebkov to respond to them.

First a few words about our interlocutor. Andrey Adamovich Trebkov is 52 years old. He is a graduate of the Sverdlovsk Juridical Institute and the Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee. A Candidate of Juridical Sciences and Distinguished Jurist of the RSFSR, he has worked as a people's judge and chairman of the regional people's court in Tyumen Oblast. He was elected secretary of the Tyumen Party Gorkom, and supervised a department at the Tyumen Oblast CPSU Committee. For seven years he has been a member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Justice, and head of a department on questions of legal propaganda and legal education of citizens. Since 1989 he has been a consultant at the State and Legal Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

And we are pleased to note that A.A. Trebkov has for a long time been a member of the board of editors of our magazine.

[Question] Andrey Adamovich, it's a rare week that goes by without reports of the rise of various kinds of civic social organizations. There are already over 70,000 societies, unions, fronts, funds, and centers of various kinds functioning in the country. Is this process not a tribute to fashion, a kind of imitation syndrome? This question could fully apply to the founding of your union as well.

[Trebkov] I cannot agree with your statement, that the appearance of new social organizations is merely a tribute to fashion. A new socio-political situation is now taking shape in the country. Its most characteristic and distinguishing feature is the unprecedented rise of the political activeness and political creativity of the masses. We can see how great are the people's aspirations to take part in the government of state and social affairs. This growing socio-political activeness finds its outlet both within the framework of our already-existing democratic institutions, and within newly-established ones, the number of which, as you have correctly stated, is constantly increasing.

And nevertheless I can boldly assert, that the present network of civic social organizations is not yet enough; it is not yet in a position to properly carry out the decision which Lenin promulgated on the historic task—to strive for complete participation by the masses in governing public affairs. It is no secret that specific interests of certain social and professional groups of citizens are far from completely satisfied; and that means that new social-organizational structures, called forth to solve these problems, must and shall be created. Thus, it is not only and not so much a matter of the number of civic organizations, but whether they are working for perestroika, for achieving a qualitatively new state in our society, for building a humane and democratic state; and whether they are indeed supporting the establishment of a socialist, self-governing people: to the end that this government is implemented, not only in the interests of the working people, but that it becomes to an ever-increasing extent the affair of the workers themselves.

It goes without saying that these requirements pertain wholly and completely to the USSR Lawyers' Union as well. I will not say that while it was being set up there were no questions as to, "Why is this Union needed and who needs it? And is not its creation a kind of tribute to fashion?" Such questions did arise, long before the Lawyers' Inaugural Congress, and here and there they are being asked now. And this is completely understandable. Lawyers as a whole are extremely perspicacious, careful, and even conservative in the positive sense of the word. The profession itself requires them to first "measure seven times..."

And nevertheless an absolute majority of legal professionals has spoken out in favor of creating their Union. And could it have been any other way? After all, the lawyers' aspirations to unite did not spring up overnight. They are deeply rooted in history. The lawyers of Russia set up their first legal society 127 years ago, in 1863. In all, 12 such associations were functioning before the revolution.

An attempt was undertaken to set up a Soviet Lawyers' Society in April 1927. For well-known reasons the life of this society turned out to be a short one, and the fate of its many members—tragic. This topic was actively discussed in the 1970's; however, the matter did not get beyond the discussion stage, and in those conditions it could not have been otherwise. Therefore, the establishment of the Lawyers' Union—is a specific result of perestroika.

[Question] Judging from readers' letters, they have received only sparse information with many gaps, about the Union, its goals and missions. No doubt our magazine must bear a share of the guilt for this. Could you not fill in this gap?

[Trebkov] The Union has a twofold mission. It is called upon to solve a complex of top-priority problems and future problems, concerning the social and socio-legal status of a lawyer and the disclosure of his public image,

which, as was justly stated at the Inaugural Congress, has long been besmirched and distorted, and his social capabilities have not been completely utilized. We know lawyers today more as a functionary, or as responsible officials—judges, procurators, investigators and legal consultants, and less as public figures. To a large extent this is the fault of their corporative and departmental fragmentation. Hence, the principal task of the Union is—to bring together lawyers of all specialties on the basis of the commonality of their interests, the tasks they are solving, and above all as public figures. Therefore, I agree with the proposal stated at the Congress, that the first of the Union's tasks should be to shape the public consciousness with respect to lawyers.

Speaking of consolidation of lawyers regardless of their departmental subordination, I do not at all have in mind the kind of interaction that is provided by the norms of legislative procedure. I am also opposed to further preservation of the as yet indissoluble "unity" of investigation and prosecutorial oversight over them. Practical experience and life itself have already spoken out decisively in favor of them. The overwhelming majority—both theoreticians and practitioners—take this stand. I do not think that the present organizational unity of inquest and investigation is the very unity which we need today. In brief, I am for clear-cut delimitation of the operational-inquest, investigatory, oversight, judicial, corrective-labor and protection functions. There should be no departmental combination of functions in these questions.

The problem of legal protection for lawyers has become extremely urgent in recent times. Most of all this concerns militia officials, where disrespect for their official status has become endemic. Today it is typical that people do not respond to their lawful demands, abuse them morally and physically, and at times even offer armed resistance. It is not by chance that the count of combat losses in the militia is already in the hundreds every year.

It is high time for fundamental changes to the status of legal advisors. Just how does it serve the law, if a legal advisor is now forced to show cause before the administration or the soviet of a working collective? Is it not this humiliating situation for lawyers at enterprises that is at the root of many of our troubles? For example, such things as group or collective egoism, breaking contracted obligations, low-quality production, unsanctioned strikes, and other illnesses of our economy.

And can one really say that the present legal situation of a bailiff or a legal advisor is normal? A top-priority task for our Union is to work out a reliable, effective mechanism for ensuring legal protection for lawyers.

In connection with this, in the near future we will be submitting legislative initiatives on this account, or will support those which already exist. Specifically, we are already commencing to draw up a draft law on legal service in the national economy; we are participating in

work on a draft Law on the legal protection of militia officials; and we are taking part in drafting proposals on questions of the legal situation of a bailiff and other categories of jurists.

Lawyers have united in a Union in order to justify the great social expectations and needs of the Soviet people addressed to them. Both on the plane of reliably supporting the personal security of the citizens, on the plane of legal protection in all spheres of man's vital activities, and on the plane of rendering legal assistance and conducting extensive educational work.

[Question] But after all, the Lawyers' Union is a social organizations. How can it ensure the solution of these highly specific tasks?

[Trebkov] All by the very same means—through consolidating the efforts of the lawyers. I am convinced that without such consolidation not one single problem in the formation of a socialist rule-of-law state will be successfully solved.

Take for example, the problem of the struggle with organized crime. Can it really be successfully resolved without consolidation of efforts by the professionals? As far as concrete participation by the Union in solving these problems, it goes without saying, it is not a question of replacing the law-enforcement organs. The USSR Lawyers' Union, as a social organization will offer and is already bringing to bear its influence on the solution of this problem in its inherent forms. First of all, by means of rendering assistance in raising lawyers' skill level and the moral purity of their ranks. Together with state authorities and social organizations, we are jointly drafting a Nationwide Anti-Crime Program.

[Question] At present a lot is being said about the need to significantly expand the representation of lawyers in the legislative organs. And this is entirely natural. Laws must be adopted not only on the basis of worldly experience, but also on the basis of special knowledge. Nevertheless, there are not all that many lawyers in the corps of deputies, and in the country's Supreme Soviet there is only a handful. What then will happen? Will a sense of justice replace knowledge of law? Will this not lead, as it already has, to the extremely unsatisfactory level of our laws?

[Trebkov] Dilettantism is dangerous everywhere, and especially in law-making. The state of legislation in force today is such, that one cannot call it satisfactory. At the present time there are nearly 30,000 normative acts of the USSR, adopted from 1922 through 1988. Many of them do not coincide and quite often duplicate one another; but the main thing is that—as a whole, they do not correspond with the new economic, political and other social relationships. In a number of instances, legislation, especially economic legislation which reflects the stereotypes of obsolete approaches and decisions, has a negative influence on the course of perestroika in the national economy.

Laws are discussed and adopted hastily, and draft laws are insufficiently studied, which is fraught with serious negative consequences. And that is just what happened during the preparation and adoption of laws on the state enterprise and on cooperation.

There are numerous reasons for this situation, and one of them is the fact that the broad spectrum of legal society is not sufficiently involved in drawing up the draft laws. If in this work one relies only on the traditional three or four centers which have evolved in this country, matters will not improve. Only by bringing out and uniting the efforts of lawyers—both scholars and practitioners, who work not only in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev, but also in Vladivostok, Dushanbe, Yerevan, Vilnius, and in all the republics, krais and oblasts of the country, can one seriously count upon raising the level of lawmaking activity. The central organs of the Lawyers' Union is working on this right now.

We have submitted proposals to the Supreme Soviet and to the government, that draft laws which have been drawn up be sent to the Lawyers' Union for completion.

[Question] In recent times, a shortage of legal cadres has been added to the existing list of shortage items. Many people are speaking and writing about this.

[Trebkov] And what they are saying and writing is true. Today, practically everywhere, there are not enough judges, investigators, notaries, defense attorneys and militia officials. Only one-third of the nation's enterprises and organizations have legal advisors on their staffs. The situation is even worse at executive committees of local Soviets and at ZAGS [Civil Document Registration] and social security offices. According to the most careful estimates, the country lacks about 300,000 specialists of this profile. At the present rate of training, it will require decades to fill the vacancies.

[Question] What do you propose to do to correct the situation that has taken shape?

[Trebkov] The situation has to be fundamentally changed. We believe the first step is to develop the concept of higher legal education in the country. The Union has already discussed its first variant at the plenum of its Central Council. In general, we consider one of the most important tasks of the Union is concern for young people, for training young cadres. Together with law-enforcement organs we shall take part in the selection of applicants. We want to introduce increased stipends and by-name stipends for successful students and aspirants. We shall organize contests for the best scholarly work among students and young scholars and for the best textbook on Soviet law, and we envisage special scholarships for graduate school or doctoral study, with continued payment of wages.

[Question] I would like to touch on yet another important feature in our conversation. In my view, moral sensibility has fallen into a dangerous state in the corps

of lawyers. What with all these victims, witnesses, suspects and accused persons, we lose sight of man. And after all, it is chiefly morality that serves as the cement of a society.

[Trebkov] This problem is also disturbing to the Union. Today the public is persistently posing the question of completely eliminating prejudice and tendentiousness, and an accusatory bias when conducting an inquiry, preliminary investigation, or court examination. To this, add groundless detention and arrests, many years of holding people in custody without grounds, and all the more so the condemnation of the innocent; plus, the not-infrequent manifestation of formalism and red-tape, and a thoughtless and bureaucratic attitude toward the people, and to their legal interests and requirements.

The facts indicated testify to the fact that the thought processes and style of the practical workers and their moral-legal ideology are seriously deformed. Unfortunately, far from all lawyers are prepared to abandon the obsolete patterns and dogma in their activities.

It is very necessary that lawyers understand their social duty, and the need for high skills, professional mastery and irreproachable morality. The Commission on Professional Ethics, which was elected at the Inaugural Congress, will have an important role to play in achieving these goals. We hope that its work will promote radical reform of the professional and moral consciousness of the lawyers.

[Question] We have been speaking about professional interests. And what is being done in the socio-domestic sphere?

[Trebkov] The situation here is extremely complex. It has been reported in articles in your magazine, that a judge can count on a trip to a resort hotel or sanatorium once in 20-25 years; that officials of law-enforcement organs are forced to huddle together, there's no other word for it here, in basements, in chimney-corners and other incommensurable facilities. And you see the majority of them have families... They do not have their own housing, no vacation homes, no hospitals, no kindergartens or Pioneer camps, nor a supply system. All of this quite often forces certain lawyers to resort to establishing undesirable contacts; which, naturally forces them to carry out their official duties selectively...

We have actively set about correcting the situation that has come to pass. The first sign was an agreement with industrial ministries to build a boarding house in the city of Sochi. Right now other variants are being worked out as well.

The Union will render assistance in taking trips during tourist season, in purchasing railroad and airline tickets, and in reserving hotel rooms. We will also assist in organizing housing-construction cooperatives and gardening societies, and in strengthening the material-technical bases of courts, ZAGS and notary public

offices. And we must be concerned about retiring jurists, invalids and persons living alone, and about the families of those who perish.

The idea of opening multi-purpose lawyers' buildings appears promising as well. Here they would disseminate information about Soviet legislation in order to raise the skill level of the colleagues. We hope that these buildings will also become a place for relaxation, a place for informal meetings between lawyers and members of their families; and a place for movies, plays, amateur artistic endeavors, special-interest clubs and sports sections; and places for meeting with cultural figures and masters of the arts. For instance, what's so bad about this idea: a writer, artist or director presenting their new works? Or, traveling editors from the magazine CHE-LOVEK I ZAKON meeting with lawyers in a certain city to discuss their publications.

I think that the usefulness and the interest would be mutual.

[Question] The goals are certainly praiseworthy. But in this connection the alarm of certain of our readers seems altogether valid. It is no secret that many of our social organizations are such in name only, and receive large subsidies from the state budget, or to put it more simply, from our pockets.

[Trebkov] I can say with all honesty that we have not taken a cent from the government. We have our own sources of income. These are initiation fees and membership dues, and income from our own publishing activities, and other receipts from citizens and organizations.

[Question] There is still another painful problem. This is the level of legal services to the public. The question is virtually always at the center of attention of our highest-ranking leaders and of the press, but the situation is not improving. As they say in the East, "You can say 'halva' [an Oriental sweet] a hundred times, and your mouth won't be any sweeter." Is that not why our magazine receives up to a thousand letters a day with requests to explain one legal norm or another? Many citizens, apparently in complete despair, come from all parts of the country for a personal appointment.

[Trebkov] It is high time to stop, in the most decisive manner, the shameful situation whereby, in order to receive elementary legal information, a person is forced to spend a mass of time and emotional stress, and to overcome distances of tens and at times thousands of kilometers, at his own expense. He must have the opportunity to do this in the shortest possible period at the place where he works or lives. The Union is taking this task upon itself. Incidentally, disseminating information about legal matters and the legal education of the populace is one of the top priority goals of the Union, as reflected in its Regulations.

We are striving to expand the existing legal education system, and to improve its quality. To this end the

Union has gone to the USSR Council of Ministers with a proposal on setting up an All-Union Scientific-Production Association for Rendering Legal Assistance and Universal Education. It would take upon itself the establishment of new forms of training, which operate on a cost-accounting basis. The proposal stipulates developing new academic plans and programs, textbooks and training aids, and training propagandists. We shall strive for improving the teaching of law in general-educational schools, vocational-technical schools, *tekhnikums* and *VUZ's*. We shall strive to modernize traditional forms of training as well—people's universities, reading rooms, lecture series, and paid and public legal consultations.

There is still an acute shortage of legal literature. People are deprived of the opportunity to purchase a legal code, a commentary on the law, or a handbook for their personal use. And where is the solution? The Union, along with the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Questions of Legislation, Legality and Legal Procedure; the Ministry of Justice, and the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade, have gone to the government with a petition for allocation of additional funds for paper for expanding the publication of normative-reference and scientific-popular legal literature.

And now I would like to digress from the topic and make a small amplification. Just as any other organization, the Union is required in accordance with existing legislation, to examine the essence of statements and complaints from the citizens, but, it goes without saying, within the bounds of our competence. Therefore we do not have the right to examine complaints, for example, on the illegality, in the author's opinion, of a court decision. This must be made clear, since the law defines precisely the procedure for appealing the decisions and sentences of a court.

[Question] Our readers would be interested to learn about the Union's international program as well.

[Trebkov] It will be extremely versatile. The Union has the status of a non-governmental organization at the UN. In this capacity we intend to cooperate with international, regional and national associations, the activity of which coincides with our own goals and tasks.

The forms of such contacts could vary widely. From the organization of ocean cruises for Soviet and foreign lawyers, to professional exchanges along the lines of various institutions and organizations. Why should we not learn from one another, sharing the experiences of judges and prosecutors, investigators and detectives, customs agents and public notaries? In short, across the entire spectrum of the legal profession.

This year alone we will be receiving over 30 delegations from the USA. In September of this year we plan to hold a joint Soviet-American Conference on "Law and Economic Relations." This forum will be an unprecedented event in the history of Soviet-American relations. A thousand lawyers from each side will gather in Moscow

in order to exchange opinions on questions of legal support for economic ties between the two countries.

[Question] We wish the USSR Lawyers' Union success and look forward to further cooperation.

[Trebkov] Thank you.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Che-lovek i zakon". 1990.

USSR Supreme Court Head on New Legislation

90UN1351A Moscow CHELOVEK I ZAKON
in Russian No 2, Feb 90

[Interview with Ye. A. Smolentsev, USSR Supreme Court chairman, by correspondent Vladimir Strelkov: "Steps in Judicial Reform"]

[Text] In November 1989 the USSR Supreme Soviet passed several laws relating directly to administering the law. In connection with this, our correspondent Vladimir Strelkov asked USSR Supreme Court Chairman Ye. A. Smolentsev to comment on these new acts.

[Correspondent] Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, less than three months have passed since our last conversation, when you clarified the provisions of the law "On the Status of Judges in the USSR" (No 11, 1989), and once again we feel a need to talk with you. After all, a literal squall of laws has descended upon the judicial organs.

[Smolentsev] Well, I don't know about a squall, but indeed, a great many important laws have been passed. That is the nature of our times. It is hard to find a law that exists in isolation, separate from the rest. All laws are directly interconnected, interdependent, interactive, complementary. Once you change one, invisible threads tug at the others, forcing you to make changes in them. It is this kind of process that is under way right now, when in the course of judicial reform fundamental changes are being introduced into effective legislation and completely new laws are being passed.

For instance, the Supreme Soviet passed a law "On the Status of Judges in the USSR," thus immediately giving rise to the need for new Precepts of legislation for the USSR and the union republics with respect to the judicial system. For example, a significant portion of the articles in the old Precepts were devoted to the system of selecting judges, people's assessors, their accountabilities, the claims placed on candidates for these positions, the regulation of the recall and early cessation of judges' authority. Almost one third of the Precepts! But now the need for these articles in the Precepts has fallen by the wayside because all those provisions have been codified in the USSR law "On the Status of Judges in the USSR."

[Correspondent] Clearly that is just one of the reasons for passing the new Precepts. We recall, Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, all the arguments around the draft of this law, all the proposals—and many of them were incorporated

in the articles of the law. Not only were many old provisions eliminated, but totally new articles were introduced, and others were substantially restructured.

[Smolentsev] That is correct. Let's take as an example Article 5 and the 18 Precepts of legislation for the judicial system, which assume the introduction of a new institution of judges for administrative and executive production. Now the rayon (city) people's courts in the person not only of people's courts but also of administrative and executive courts are expected to consider cases on administrative offences attributed to them by the legislation of the USSR and the union republics. Judges for administrative and executive matters are going to hear cases on administrative offences and at the instruction of the chairman of the rayon (city) people's court will also oversee the work of the bailiffs. In many of the instances envisaged by the legislation of the union republic, they will begin to entertain questions connected with the civil legal system's execution of the decisions of the courts and other organs. Note well: the Precepts do not establish what claims are to be placed on candidates for administrative and executive judges, nor do they specify a method for their recall or early dismissal, or for calling them to account. All these questions are to be decided by union republic legislation.

Why was it necessary to make this innovation in the law? Because recently the load on people's courts for cases of administrative offences has increased sharply, due to the strengthened struggle against minor hooliganism, minor speculation. Moreover, to the category of administrative offences we have now added simple contraband, moonshining, and the use of narcotics. It has worked out that on average a people's judge has to hear 50 cases a month on administrative offences. And that is apart from his criminal and civil cases. Can we expect a high quality of work given that kind of workload? The new institution of administrative and executive judges is intended to disburden the people's judges substantially, to strengthen control over executive production in criminal and civil cases, a control that right now is clearly insufficient in our courts. Finally, this innovation will help to improve the selection of candidates for the position of judge, candidates who could be trained, at least partially, on the account of administrative court judges.

[Correspondent] It is interesting that the new Precepts include articles regulating the activity of the trial secretary and the court apparatus. The old Precepts contained nothing of the kind. And we would say that the overwhelming majority of citizens have judged the trial secretary's work merely by the words they traditionally speak: "All rise, please. The court is now in session!" This modest, quiet figure who takes constant notes of some kind during the trial has not distinguished himself in any other way.

[Smolentsev] That's it exactly—modest! But only outwardly. Because that modesty conceals intense, important work by a crucial trial figure. It is on his shoulders that the greater part of the preparation for the trial rests,

and finally, taking the minutes, that most critical document, which must reflect in precise detail the entire course of the trial, including the statements and petitions of persons participating in the case, certain determinations of the court, the detailed content of the testimonies, the questions put to the expert and his answers, the results of examinations and other actions relating to the collection of evidence carried out in the trial, instructions on facts that persons participating in the case have asked to verify in the minutes, instructions on facts of a violation of order in the courtroom, the brief content of the pleadings and the defendant's closing words, as well as a multitude of other details of the trial. The minutes are signed by two persons: the presiding judge and the trial secretary. So that it was appropriate and logical to define the status of the trial secretary; it has, in essence, restored justice with respect to this important person. The same can be said of the court apparatus, which sees to its work in bringing about justice, in generalizing judicial practice, in analyzing judicial statistics. Put another way, the court apparatus also fills important functions without which it would be extremely difficult to organize the work of the organ of justice.

[Correspondent] What gave rise to the necessity to introduce changes into so many articles, for example, on the equality of citizens before the law and the court, on the right of citizens to legal defense and others? After all, all this was contained in the old Precepts.

[Smolentsev] The times themselves have dictated the necessity to introduce these changes and additions. I will begin with Article 6 of the Precepts, which is concerned with guaranteeing the equality of citizens before the law and the court. Please note: in the new edition the list of conditions that are not supposed to influence the performance of justice or the implementation of the legal decision with respect to concrete persons, includes the official status of the citizen, which wasn't there before. This speaks for itself, I think.

Then there is Article 7 on the right of citizens to legal defense. New here is the fact that instructions have been added here on the right of citizens to legal defense for infringements not only on their honor, pride, life, health, personal freedom, and property, but also on all the other rights and freedoms provided for by the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics, and Soviet laws. Relevant here are freedom of conscience, the freedom to participate in demonstrations, street marches, meetings, and so on, the significance of which for citizens is obvious.

Now let us turn to a very important innovation established in Article 11 of the Precepts. If before the concept of collectiveness in the court of first instance was unambiguous—the judge and two people's assessors—then the new Precepts indicate the possibility of hearing cases at the first instance with an expanded bench of judges and people's assessors. This further democratizes the process and makes it permissible to include in it a great number of citizens selected by the people's assessors on an equal

footing with the judges. This unquestionably will have a positive effect on the level of justice, will improve its objectivity and independence. Especially in those instances envisaged by union or republic legislation, it presents an opportunity to expand the makeup of the court at the expense of both the people's assessors and the professional judges.

[Correspondent] I have a question for you, Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, which may not be altogether delicate but still wants clarification. I recall your statements in the press disapproving the proposals to introduce the institution of the jury. However, the approved Precepts establish that in the procedure established by the legislation of the union republics for cases of crimes punishable by death or by incarceration for a term of more than ten years, the question of the defendant's guilt can be decided by a jury (an expanded collective of people's assessors).

[Smolentsev] Yes, in the discussion of the draft Precepts in the Supreme Soviet I did maintain that opinion. However, once the Precepts were passed and became law, for me that too became a law. Now our task is to help elaborate an optimal form for the activities of the jury. After all, a great deal here remains unclear. For instance, what kind of authority ought it have, ought this type of court pronounce only the verdict, that is, decide merely the one question about the defendant's guilt, or can it pass sentence in general? There are other questions as well. We are going to have to study judicial practice and the experience of foreign countries and choose all that is best for our country. But each union republic will resolve these problems independently.

A significant innovation is the addition regarding the open examination of cases in the courts. As you remember, before the Precepts were passed a statute existed according to which the hearing of a case in closed session was permitted only in those instances established by law, and provided all the rules of legal proceedings were observed. Now those same Precepts establish that in all instances, including the examination of cases in closed session, the legal decisions are to be announced publicly, thereby increasing the glasnost of legal proceedings, which in our current circumstances is natural and essential.

The question of the presumption of innocence is very important. The USSR Constitution proclaims that no one can be deemed guilty of committing a crime or subjected to criminal punishment other than by a court's sentence and in accordance with the law. The Precepts of legislation for the USSR and the union republics regarding the judicial system supplement and clarify this constitutional statute by making it necessary that the guilt of the accused be established by a court verdict that has gone into legal force. And this is reasonable because a verdict that has not gone into force cannot entail any legal consequences for the accused, even in the question of establishing his guilt.

Article 16 of the Precepts, about the prosecutor's participation in the examination of cases in the courts, has great significance. The previously effective Precepts provided for prosecutor's oversight over the execution of laws in court hearings of cases. But that statute contradicted the fundamental principles of justice and diminished the authority and independence of the court. Any oversight over the court, even from the prosecutor's office, casts doubt on the principle of the court's independence. Moreover, this function is not provided for by the USSR Constitution and now does not conform to the law of the USSR "On the Status of Judges in the USSR." That is why the new Precepts speak only about the prosecutor's participation in the hearing as an equal with the party's defender in the trial.

Changing even a single word in a law at times entails changing its entire content. As an example, the old Precepts establish that the USSR Ministry of Justice and its local organs are to carry out organized supervision of the courts. But the organs of state government, such as the Ministry of Justice and its local organs, cannot administer the courts, regardless of the pretext. Now, in the new Precepts, the Justice Ministry and its local organs are charged only with the organizational guarantee of the courts' activity, assuming strict observance of the principle of independence of the judges and their subordination to only the law. The Justice Ministry and its organs are already charged with very important and crucial tasks—elaborating and introducing proposals into the appropriate congresses of people's deputies on issues relating to the organization of the courts' work, holding elections for the courts, carrying out the nomination and preparation of candidates for judge, improving the qualifications of court personnel and their material and technical equipment.

[Correspondent] Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, we have been talking a lot about the independence of judges, their subordination to only the law. The fundamental guarantees of this constitutional principle are established in the law "On the Status of Judges in the USSR." Doesn't it seem to you, though, that in fact all is not as well as we would like? The fact that "telephone law" is in effect to this day, that anyone with half a mind to do so can apply "forceful pressure" to the courts? One doesn't have to go far for examples. Here is the determination of the Zagorsk City People's Court of Moscow Oblast from 3 September 1989, signed by presiding people's judge A. P. Uteshev and two people's assessors: "The court feels that the given criminal case must be referred to another people's court, insofar as the court staff is being pressured by leaders and workers of the Zagorsk OVD to pronounce a guilty verdict in a specific case. Thus, on 7 September 1989, when before the start of the session the court staff found itself in the office of People's Judge A. P. Uteshev, Yu. V. Babakin and B. V. Baskakov, deputy heads of the Zagorsk OVD, walked in and demanded the court staff render a guilty verdict, and if they didn't, then People's Judge Uteshev and they [i.e., Babakin and Baskakov—Ed.] would no longer have jobs in the law

enforcement organs." In connection with this determination the case was remanded for hearing to the Pushkinskiy City People's Court of Moscow Oblast.

[Smolentsev] I'm not familiar with this case. But if something like that did happen, then there are no words to describe properly the scandalous outrage committed by those who are supposed to respect and obey the laws more than anyone else, to be an example for others. Such escapades have to be called to strictest account.

It is perfectly obvious how timely it was for the USSR Supreme Soviet to pass on 2 November 1989 the USSR law "On Amenability for Contempt of Court." I will remind you that, by carrying out the constitutional principle of the independence of judges and people's assessors and their subordination to only the law, the law "On the Status of Judges in the USSR" instructs that the independence of judges and people's assessors is guaranteed, in particular, by amenability for contempt of court and intervention in the resolution of legal matters. And although in civil as well as criminal trial legislation there are many norms affecting amenability for failure to fulfill the requirements of the court, there were no special norms on amenability for interference in the resolution of legal matters. There were no special norms on amenability for threatening a judge or a people's assessor, for insulting these persons, or for not taking measures appropriate to the court's particular determination or the judge's presentation. It is understandable that a situation when the judge or people's assessor are in fact defenseless in the face of threats or insults scarcely facilitates the authority and prestige of justice or, consequently, respect for the law.

Of course, we cannot compel anyone to respect the court merely by harsh sanctions alone. As the saying goes, love cannot be compelled. After all, for decades judges frequently had to acquiesce to rayon-, oblast-, and sometimes even higher-level leadership. In those instances, judges' "independence" was purely formal. The types of pressure applied to unyielding people were quite diverse: threats of not being reappointed for a new term, refusal to get the judge an apartment or the court new quarters or repairs. There were even instances when the circuit court gathered somewhere in a rayon, lots of people came, and it turned out to be impossible to start only because an "affronted" sovkhoz director or organization leader wouldn't let the people's assessor off work.

The USSR law "On Amenability for Contempt of Court" ought to help radically in solving these problems; moreover, note, inasmuch as the principle of judges' independence and immunity is established by the USSR Constitution, the norms connected with it on amenability for contempt of court have equal force over the territory of the entire country. Put differently, unitary, all-union norms have been called upon to strengthen the independence of judges and the prestige of the court

everywhere. However this does not exclude the possibility of supplemental norms being passed in the republics on amenability for contempt of court and for interfering in legal actions relating to the implementation of justice.

Thus, the first article of this law establishes that influence of any form whatsoever on judges or people's assessors with the goal of hindering a thoroughgoing, full, and objective hearing of a specific case or of obtaining the rendering of an illegal decision is punishable by corrective labor for a term of up to one year or by a fine of up to 1,000 rubles. But if the commission of these acts involves exploiting an official position, then the guilty party can be punished by incarceration for a period of up to three years or by corrective labor for a term of from one to two years. Criminal amenability is provided for with respect to both citizens and public servants, but with this distinction, that if the commission of illegal acts entails exploiting an official position, than a more severe punishment can be meted out. I hope that the legislature's passage of such measures will compel those who favor "telephone law" to give it some serious thought.

The next article of the law establishes criminal amenability for threatening murder, assault, or destruction of property to a judge or a people's assessor, as well as to their close relatives, in connection with the implementation of justice by the judge or people's assessor. For such a threat the guilty party can be subjected to incarceration for a term of up to two years or to corrective labor of the same term. The third article provides for punishment for insulting a judge or a people's assessor in connection with their activity in carrying out justice. Both these articles strengthen the legal defensibility of judges and people's assessors. After all, it is not that infrequent that one or the other is threatened or insulted in connection with their work. With respect to workers in the militia and the voluntary people's patrol, the law included special norms that provide for amenability for insulting them in connection with their carrying out of the responsibilities placed on them for safeguarding public order, but unfortunately there was no such norm for a judge or people's assessor; now that gap has been filled.

Also important is the article of the law on amenability for nonimplementation of a judicial decision. For example, having restored a citizen to his job, defending his honor and dignity in all other instances, the official receives the court's decision, sentence, determination, or decree and purposely does not carry it out or else purposely impedes its implementation. The guilty party in this crime can be fined from 300 to 1,000 rubles.

Meanwhile, according to the law, the judge can now impose administrative penalties as well for such violations as contempt of court, preventing the appearance in court of a people's assessor, and not taking measures in accordance with the special determination (decree) of the court or the representation of the judge.

Contempt of court covers such acts as the malicious refusal to appear in court by a witness, victim, plaintiff, or defendant, or insubordination by these persons or other citizens to the instruction of the presiding judge. Contempt of court also covers disturbing the peace during a trial, as well as the commission by anyone whatsoever of acts testifying to blatant disregard for the organ of justice or the rules established in court. Punishment for these violations is administrative arrest for a term of up to 15 days or a fine in the amount of up to 100 rubles.

It should be said that some administrators do not release people's assessors from production so that they can carry out the responsibilities assigned to them in court. Especially good workers, because this, they say, affects overall labor productivity. Here they come up with the most diverse excuses: disruption of the plan, workload, local business trips, and many others. According to the USSR law "On Amenability for Contempt of Court," the judge can impose an administrative fine in the amount of up to 100 rubles against an official who, regardless of the excuse, has impeded the appearance in court of the people's assessor.

Finally, the law establishes amenability for not taking measures according to the special determination (decree) of the court or representation of the judge. This is also a very important norm. I will remind you that, according to criminal-legal legislation, the court in the presence of appropriate bases pronounces simultaneously with the decree of the sentence a private determination that draws the attention of the leaders of institutions, enterprises, organizations and other persons to the reasons and conditions that facilitated the commission of the crime and asks them to take appropriate measures. The leaders of those institutions and organizations, officials, are required to inform the court within a month about the measures they have taken. A private determination can also be made following the results of the hearing of a civil case, and such a determination also requires that measures be taken. Unfortunately, some leaders and officials, having received the private determination, haven't even felt a need to respond to it. Now the law compels them to treat this requirement with all seriousness as well, for leaving a private determination (decree) of the court or representation of a judge unexamined, or not taking measures to eliminate the violations of law they indicate, as well as tardy response to them, will entail the imposition on the official of an administrative penalty in the form of a fine in the amount of up to 100 rubles.

The USSR law "On Amenability for Contempt of Court" already went into force on 1 December 1989.

[Correspondent] It is impossible to ignore the fact, Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, that the new laws devote much more attention than before to the amenability of officials. In this respect, evidently, it is necessary to comment on the USSR law "On the Procedure for Appealing

in Court Illegal Actions by the Organs of State Government and Officials Infringing on the Rights of Citizens," which will go into effect on 1 July 1990.

[Smolentsev] Yes, it will go into effect in place of the USSR law, passed on 30 June 1987, "On the Procedure for Appealing in Court Illegal Actions by Officials Infringing on the Rights of Citizens," which on 1 July 1990 loses its forces, although, it must be confessed, its application has helped somewhat to improve the responsibility of officials for the appropriate implementation of official duties connected with the observance of the rights of citizens. In 1988 over 3,000 complaints on these questions came before the court, and in the first half of 1989 there were over 2,000. The courts were able to satisfy a significant portion of the complaints and in this manner the rights of a significant number of citizens were restored.

And still...As the practice of applying this law has shown, it proved insufficiently effective because officials, after deciding one question or another frequently prefer to carry out their negative decisions through collective organs, which could not be appealed in court, even if they were carried out in violation of the law and infringed on the rights of citizens. True, even at that time, effective laws gave citizens rather broad rights to legal defense, but in those instances when a dispute arose from property, labor, housing, kolkhoz, patent, and certain other legal considerations.

But many other instances could be cited when as a result of illegal decisions made by collective organs a person was deprived of the opportunity to realize his right fully or in part or to defend himself. As an example, Article 20 of the Precepts of housing legislation of the USSR and union republics grants some citizens the right to acquire living quarters ahead of the line. This right is held by members of families of soldiers who died or were lost in action at the front, people suffering from severe forms of certain chronic diseases, teachers and other pedagogical workers in schools of general education and professional-technical educational institutions, and others. As you see, we are talking about a very important right. But here a collective organ of administration illegally refused someone this right and he couldn't appeal this decision in court, due to the fact that it had been made collectively.

Or a problem like this. In correspondence with existing procedure, refusal to register or unregister someone for improved living conditions is not subject to appeal in court due to the fact that the resolution of these questions is referred to special ispolkom commissions. So starting on 1 July 1990, interested citizens in this case too shall receive the right to legal defense. In general now, the right has been established to appeal illegal actions on the part of any collective organ of state government carrying out executive and management functions, including ispolkoms of local soviets, ministries, state committees, and other organs of government.

The question arises as to whether in this case one can appeal acts by organs of state power, including decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies. No, the courts have not been given this right because in accordance with Article 125 of the USSR Constitution, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee carries out the functions of constitutional oversight.

I will also talk about whether it is possible to appeal actions of collective organs of public organizations in court. As we know, public organizations (party, Komsomol, trade union, and others) function on the basis of regulations that also determine the procedure for appealing the decisions of their collective organs. Thus, a decision to exclude someone from membership in the CPSU can be appealed right up to the Party Control Committee (KPK) of the CPSU Central Committee and even to the CPSU congress. The court, naturally, cannot hear complaints of this nature.

The regulations of cooperative organizations, as it says in Article 11 of the law "On Cooperation in the USSR," "is the fundamental document regulating their activity." The procedure for appealing decisions of the collective organs of a cooperative are determined by the regulations, other normative acts, and also by the law "On Cooperation in the USSR." Thus, the decision of a general assembly to exclude someone from membership in the cooperative can be appealed in court. If a citizen who is not a member of the cooperative works in it on a contract basis, the court can hear all his labor disputes with the cooperative, including complaints about decisions of its collective organs.

I would like to draw attention to provision in the law according to which a complaint against an action of an organ of government or an official can be submitted to the court only after first appealing to a high-ranking person in the organ or an official. This procedure in many instances ensures a more effective defense against infringed rights and more successfully aids the struggle against bureaucratism, and in many instances even eliminates citizens' need to turn to the court.

The law also talks about the fact that if in hearing a citizen's complaint the court comes to the conclusion that established procedure for hearing citizens' suggestions, notices, and complaints has been violated, if there has been undue red tape, suppression of criticism, or other violations of legality, the court renders a private determination and directs it to a high-ranking official or to the organ, and they are required to inform the court within a month about the measures undertaken in response to this private determination. Well, earlier I already recounted all the consequences officials can incur if they do not undertake such measures.

[Correspondent] But after all, in hearing a complaint, couldn't the court uncover evidence of crime in the actions of an official or other person, for example, the fact of persecuting citizens for criticism?

[Smolentsev] According to Article 139 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (the criminal codes of the other union republics have similar articles), intentional infringement by an official of a citizen's rights and legally protected interests connected with the persecution of him for submitting proposals, notices, or complaints according to established procedure, either for the criticism they contain or for coming out with criticism in another form, is punishable by a fine of up to 300 rubles or by dismissal. And if the same actions have caused significant harm to the rights and legally protected interests of citizens, the guilty party can be punished by incarceration for a term of up to two years or by corrective labor for a term of from one to two years or by dismissal. So that, should such a crime be discovered, the court can inform the prosecutor or can itself institute a criminal case.

In conclusion I want to say that, despite the apparent great number of new laws passed in the area of judicial activity, this is in essence merely the beginning of an extremely complicated job of carrying out judicial reform, of reexamining the norms of criminal, criminal-legal, and corrective-labor legislation, of revitalizing the entire legal system and bringing it into line with the modern conditions of our society's development.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Che-lovek i zakon".

Ukrainian Writers Blast Repressive Republic Press

90UN1197A Kiev *LITERATURNIA UKRAYINA*
in *Ukrainian* No 9, 1 Mar 90 p 1

[Statement by the Party Committee of the Kiev Organization of the Union of Ukrainian Writers: "To the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party"]

[Text] The Party Committee of the Kiev Writers Organization expresses its concern in connection with the sharp worsening of interethnic relations in our country, which in some regions has led to bloodshed. Thousands of refugees are fleeing from their villages and towns, but in the new localities as well they frequently encounter hostility and malevolence, since local officials sometimes not only fail to restrain unhealthy passions among the public but even encourage such passions. Such has been the case in particular in many towns and villages in the Crimea, the destination of Crimean Tatars who were deported 45 years ago.

Unfortunately a substantial contribution toward igniting the flames of ethnic conflict is being made by certain central newspapers and magazines through the articles they publish, as well as by some publications in the Ukraine, particularly PRAVDA UKRAINY (A. Zonenko, editor), ROBITNYCHA HAZETA (M. Shybyk, editor), and PRAPOR KOMUNIZMU (O. Sytnyk, editor). Instead of doing everything possible to consolidate the efforts of people of the different nationalities and ethnic groups living in the Ukraine (who include Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Belorussians, Poles, Hungarians, Moldavians, Gagauz, Crimean Tatars, Greeks, Armenians, Azeris, Koreans, etc), instead of demonstrating more clearly how in the times of perestroika peoples which were disenfranchised under Stalinism and the Brezhnev regime are reawakening and taking first steps along the road of spiritual rebirth, PRAVDA UKRAINY is in fact continuing the old Suslov-Malanchuk policy of "grinding up" nations, a policy of Russification. You will find few articles about the Crimean Tatars in PRAVDA UKRAINY, the return of whom to their historical homeland has taken on a highly dramatic turn of events through the fault of certain Simferopol officials, and one sees almost nothing about the Jews, who are continuing to this day to leave their Soviet homeland in mass numbers.... And this newspaper's attitude toward Ukrainian culture and persons active in Ukrainian culture, toward the language and history of the Ukraine is often prejudiced and hostile.

One could enumerate a long list of articles appearing in PRAVDA UKRAINY (just in 1989 alone) in which the dignity of our nation is ground under foot by the Stalinist assimilators, who still call themselves "internationalists." The anti-Ukrainian and anti-writer campaign, which was instigated by high-level officials back during the time of Shcherbitskiy, was most extensively manifested precisely in PRAVDA UKRAINY.

Under the pretext of discussing the draft Program of the Ukrainian Popular Movement for Perestroika, PRAVDA UKRAINY proceeded to insult and defame Ukrainian writers and artists, in some ways even outdoing the print media of 1937-1938, 1946-1947, 1949, 1951, and 1953, when the latter were "thrashing" "Trotskyites" and "Bukharinites," "Ukrainian nationalists," "cosmopolitans," and then once again "nationalists" and "doctor-murderers."

On 19 March 1989 one V. Volochkov, in a discussionary article entitled "When Party Ethics Are Forgotten," accuses I. Drach, V. Yavorivskyy, P. Osadchuk, V. Donchuk, and V. Bryukhovetskyy of "factionalism and cliquishness," which is "incompatible with Marxist-Leninist party-mindedness," as well as of nationalism (here too reference to followers of Bandera is not mere happenstance); V. Volochkov finds talk about republic sovereignty merely amusing, and he sarcastically places quotation marks around statements about "restoration of the republic's full sovereignty." On 23 March 1989 this same newspaper published a vicious lampoon entitled "Plain Talk," in which USSR and Ukrainian SSR State Prize recipient Ivan Drach is slandered.

One could cite a great many such "articles." Mockery and bad-mouthing of Ukrainian writers pursues the primary objective of convincing readers that there is no decent literature in the Ukraine which the people could possibly want. Are we just talking about literature? Nor is there a language! During those months when the draft Law on Languages was being discussed, PRAVDA UKRAINY published (in May 1989) a highly offensive letter written by one Mezghzerina, who outright denies the right of Kiev to be a Ukrainian city and the right of the Ukrainian language to be the republic's official language. PRAVDA UKRAINY accuses the Veselka Publishing House, through Mezghzerina's lips, of "suppression" of Russian-language writers, which is an outright lie.

Even more dirt was cast at Ukrainian writers on the eve of and during the proceedings of the Constituent Congress of Rukh. An "expert" by the name of M. Derimov was particularly diligent in these labors. A female college student from overseas came to attend the congress of the Ukrainian Language Society and spoke at this congress. Derimov immediately presents in PRAVDA UKRAINY a bunch of fabricated compromising materials against her. The whole purpose is to discredit the Ukrainians! As soon as Rukh addresses the question of the lawlessness of the Stalin regime, Derimov immediately comes up with his next "expose"—about followers of Bandera or about foreign intelligence services.

In order to "prove" what bad people these Ukrainians are, PRAVDA UKRAINY denies them a history, symbols, national worth and dignity. An article by V. Shleyev entitled "National or Nationalistic" (PRAVDA UKRAINY, 17 December 1989), which was rightly

ridiculed in our press, is just such a piece—crude, ignorant, and written following the principle of resorting to any lie.

Nor is PRAVDA UKRAINY ceasing its unworthy activities in 1990. On 23 and 24 January it featured several articles in which anti-Soviet statements and the desire to “disunite” the people of the Ukraine, who number in the many millions, are ascribed to participants in the chain of unity which stretched from Lvov to Kiev. These articles also repeated the trite Stalin-Kaganovich utterances about the revolution in the Ukraine and its complexity. The falsifiers from PRAVDA UKRAINY tried to find “compromising materials” here as well, and when they found none, they made some up.

On 28 January this newspaper contained an “account” of events at a mass meeting by the Arsenal, an article which made mention of both “extremists” and “nationalists,” but it forgot to say anything about the fact that 72 years ago an “internationalist” like some of those at PRAVDA UKRAINY, leftist Socialist Revolutionary Muravyev, drenched the entire city of Kiev with the blood of Ukrainians. And there were many more victims at that time than when they crushed the Arsenal uprising.

In the 14 February 1990 issue of PRAVDA UKRAINY, an article entitled “Autonomy in Union” examines the idea of state sovereignty of the Ukraine from this newspaper’s customary position of the period of stagnation.

It seems to us that the newspaper PRAVDA UKRAINY, which has long been expressing the views of chauvinist circles in a host of articles, should not so openly declare its colonialist position.

It is our conviction that the campaign of slander organized in the mass media against the Ukrainian Popular Movement for Perestroika and the movement’s founders, and particularly against writers who are party members, and attempts to set the intelligentsia against the worker class and peasantry, to sow seeds of suspicion and fear among the non-Ukrainian population have not only undermined the prestige of leading party agencies but have also led to intensification of the atmosphere of social instability and moral-psychological tension in this republic.

Suffice it to mention group and individual statements by our academicians, representatives of the worker class, military personnel and pensioners, who have repeated almost word for word “their own” (in fact borrowed from a distributed “methods guide”) counterarguments, without even noting that they are criticizing an unpublished version of the Rukh Program.... We might mention numerous articles published in PRAVDA UKRAINY, ROBITNYCHA HAZETA, RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, PRAPOR KOMUNIZMU and certain other periodicals: “‘Unifying Link’ Which Disunites,” “Impatience and Intolerance,” “Yavorivsky’s Neo-Banderist Rantings,” etc)—the list goes on and on; it will then become evident that the provocative rumors

which are going around about allegedly planned pogroms have fallen upon well-watered soil.

Is nobody going to answer for this? Are we once again going to look for the guilty parties among the “informal” organizations, which have so long and purposefully been the target of accusations? This is both intolerable and frightening, because it clearly reminds one of the rotten smell of an undismantled Stalin mobile gas chamber. And it is very sad for us Communists to realize that certain periodicals of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee as well as certain oblast, city, and rayon newspapers are acting, without any moral restraints, as the tenders of this misanthropic machine.

Proceeding from the position that the principle of so-called “party” (party administrative apparatus in actual fact) guidance of literature and the press has been compromised once and for all and that today, in a period of restructuring, it is clearly and obviously displaying its antidemocratic, backward-turning directional thrust, we members of the party committee of the Kiev Organization of the Union of Ukrainian Writers, are of the conviction that:

- organization of the literary process in this republic is the business of the writers themselves, not of functionaries in the party administrative apparatus and other nonliterary establishments, who frequently make use of all moral-repressive measures to exert ideological pressure on the writer, and particularly monopoly control of the press, television, and radio;
- the practice, which has been followed for many years, of dictatorially placing party administrators in the position of editors of newspapers and magazines as well as executives of publishing houses is unacceptable and, with few exceptions, unwarranted and unjustified;
- a system whereby top executives of branch and literary publications must be approved by the Central Committee of the Republic Party Organization is undemocratic and a carryover practice from the past. The party nomenklatura [schedule of appointments reserved for the party] (especially the “uchetnaya nomenklatura”) should contain only the executives running those publications which are official party organs or which belong to the party;
- mandatory approval by Central Committee departments of materials to appear in the print media is intolerable;
- conferences held at the party Central Committee and oblast committees with the participation of chief editors of arts and literary publications and publishing houses should not be of the nature of imposing instructions or orders;
- policy in this republic pertaining to size of press run should not be based on consideration of party budget revenues but should be based on actual need. The

"leftover" principle which is applied to literary-arts magazines in allocating paper is one example of ideological monopoly on the part of the party administrative apparatus.

The "campaign" against an independent, alternative press and, particularly, fines imposed on those responsible for xerox copying by the Union of Ukrainian Writers (where the newspaper RUKH was printed) and the Ukrainian Language Society imeni Taras Shevchenko is a vivid example of the monopoly right of the party administrative apparatus to dissemination of information.

We feel very strongly that the prestige of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee is suffering appreciable damage due to the position taken by the Central Committee administrative apparatus and Ukrainian SSR Goskomizdat which is directed against publication of the NARODNA HAZETA. Deliberate foot-dragging and creation of obstacles at the administrative level in the path of the newspaper of the Popular Movement also undermines the personal prestige of Central Committee First Secretary V. A. Ivashko, who stated in a foreign radio interview that such a newspaper will commence publication in this republic.

The situation in Kiev and in the Ukraine in general is increasingly deteriorating. The recent Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet appeal to the workers of this republic has not put an end to the disturbing rumors, a substantial role in the spreading of which has been played by the press, which is under the control of the system of rule by administrative fiat.

The "countenance of the enemy" clearly emerges from official sources and documents: extremists, nationalists, in short the unofficial organizations ["neformaly"], and first and foremost those who defend the idea of perestroika and national revival and who resolutely condemn Stalinism and neo-Stalinism.

And finally, we appeal to you to realize that he who, exercising a monopoly right to the truth and dissemination of information, disinform the public, introduces confusion into societal affairs, and demoralizes people, is taking on a heavy burden of answerability to the people.

Party Committee of the Kiev Organization of the Union of Ukrainian Writers.

Burlatsky Profiled as Editor of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA

*18120120A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 16, 29 Apr-6 May 90 p 14*

[Article by Ivan Podshivalov: "A New Man For An Old Office: Elected By Colleagues, Fyodor Burlatsky Takes Over LITERATURNAYA GAZETA"]

[Text] His secretary in the surprisingly small reception room looked self-confident, in the best traditions of the 1970s, so you felt she had been there for a long time. "Ten years," she said. But her new boss had come to the adjacent office behind double doors only a fortnight ago.

On March 15 a second session of the Secretariat of the Union of Soviet Writers confirmed Fyodor Burlatsky's appointment as Editor-in-Chief of the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, after settling differences which arose at the first session.

Although the report published in the LG did not mention it, one could sense tension in literary and political quarters. All ended well, however, and the man supported by 240 members of the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA staff was confirmed in office.

He has now produced four issues. What is the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA like? In the Brezhnev years it played the important role of a safety valve giving vent to the discontent felt by the intelligentsia. Every intellectual read the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA then. In 1990, five years since perestroika began, it lost 1.5 million of its subscribers. Circulation is still about five million, but it is clear to both contributors and readers that Fyodor Burlatsky has taken over at a low point in the paper's fortunes. The Soviet writers who stand behind the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA as its publishers are bitterly dissatisfied with the weekly, too. That's why they are all concerned about the course along which this major national Russian-language newspaper will be steered by its new Editor-in-Chief.

Fyodor Burlatsky, Ph.D. is 63 and for years had been one of the best-known Soviet publicists. A namesake of Dostoyevsky, a former adviser to Khrushchev who has written a memoir about him, Burlatsky always stresses his anti-Stalinist convictions. His face is familiar to Soviet TV viewers: a member of the Soviet parliament, he often speaks out on key issues of our new policies. He chairs the USSR Deputies' Club and a subcommittee on humanitarian, cultural and scientific relations. Also, he's a long-standing member of the Union of Soviet Writers, admitted on the strength of his books about Machavelli, Mao Zedong, Hitler, Franco, the play "Adviser to His Majesty" and other scripts. Since 1967 he has been demoted three times for "improper" publications. A collective letter from the staff of the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA points out that he "does not belong to any of the existing groupings." He says: "I have always been interested in the problems of authoritarian and totalitarian power."

His wife, an employee of Progress Publishers, often contributes to the MOSKOVSKY KOMSOMOLETS newspaper under the penname Kira Vladina. He has three children. The eldest son is 37 and a Doctor of Science, a theoretical physicist. His second son is a journalist by education and a student of mass information in a free society. His daughter goes to school. "They are good children," says the father who had, at the age of

his eldest son, following Khrushchev's fall, deliberately resigned from his high post as subsection head in the CPSU Central Committee and made a resolution never again to belong to any power structure.

"Did you then realize the risks involved in your proximity to the highest echelons of power?"

"We felt the danger daily," he said, the "we" standing for Georgy Shakhnazarov, Alexander Bovin, Yuri Arbatov, Oleg Bogomolov and Fyodor Petrenko, whom he brought together, worked alongside and who remain his friends to this day. As to his proximity to the key figures in Soviet politics, the Editor-in-Chief of the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA says evasively: "I have certain contacts, accumulated over the years, with those people of my generation who are now ruling the country." A yet more direct question is followed by a yet more elusive answer: "Mikhail Gorbachev was accessible to all deputies when he chaired the Supreme Soviet. Now, as President, it may be more difficult, but when the question of presidency was discussed I spoke out for his regular meetings with the press, in the American style. We need contacts with the top leadership, but it is no less important than the form of such contacts be adequate."

The old forms are obviously giving way. The ideological department of the CPSU Central Committee for unknown reasons did not publicly express its attitude to Burlatsky's candidacy, so Burlatsky paid a visit to the department only after the appointment. "They listened to me rather than preached." Incidentally, V. Yegorov, deputy chief of the said department and Burlatsky's contestant at the first stage, withdrew his candidacy early on. The second rival, writer Prokhanov, had to be outvoted at the session of the Secretariat of the Union of Soviet Writers.

He can only be pinned down in the office early in the morning. Then an office car takes him to the Kremlin, to attend the sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Then in the afternoon he is back to his LITERATURNAYA GAZETA office, which is rather typical for an official of his rank: a modest carved wooden set of furniture,

volumes of complete works the same as in every editor's office and a couple of poorly executed portraits. Topping a pile of magazines on his desk is the MOLODAYA GVARDIYA. Add to that a grandfather clock and an old Moscow cityscape beyond the window.

The important step made in the first two weeks was the removal to "another job" of the First Deputy Editor-in-Chief who had been for all practical purposes managing the newspaper. More replacements and staff changes will follow. "We intend to make radical changes in our team of journalists. The paper should be produced by people of 30 to 40. The generation of the 1960s is on the way out." He is very loyal to his predecessors, though: "Alexander Chakovsky created the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's images as we know it today. He used to tell me: 'You are an anti-Stalinist, and I am a Stalinist. You are an innovator, and I am a conservative. But I will not interfere with you.' And he never did. As for Yuri Voronov, he is my friend and I have deep respect for him. Unfortunately, he is seriously ill and could not do much."

The promotion from political analyst (the post he held for seven years) to Editor-in-Chief has brought Fyodor Burlatsky an extra 20 roubles a month, his monthly salary now being 550.

Some of my questions received firm answer:

Aren't you afraid that your political self-control may interfere with your work?

I don't think journalistic zeal is alien to me. But I hate hullabaloo.

Which people gave up their subscriptions to the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA last year?

The extreme left and the extreme right. This is a danger signal to us, but no cause for alarm.

Would you like to follow in your colleague Ivan Laptev's steps?

No. My natural role is that of an adviser.

Chernobyl Society Registered

90UN1205A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 16 Feb 90 p 3

[RATAU news release: "Bylaws of Chernobyl Alliance Society Registered"]

[Text] The Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers has registered the Bylaws of the Chernobyl Alliance All-Union Voluntary Society.

The newly-formed society is a mass public organization the purpose of which is to protect and defend the rights of citizens who took part in disaster recovery efforts at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant and who have suffered from this disaster, as well as those who have been affected by any and all types of ionizing radiation. The Society will build its activities on the basis of creative initiative and volunteer activity under the slogan "Humanity and Charity."

The Bylaws state that the society's activities shall be conducted in close contact with trade unions, government agencies, and public organizations.

Food Additives to Counteract Radiation

90UN1205B Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 16 Feb 90 p 3

[Unattributed article: "Food Against... Strontium"]

[Text] Radioactive contamination of a number of rayons in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Russian Federation as a consequence of the disaster at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant has advanced the problem of creating means capable of reducing the accumulation of radionuclides in people's systems.

The Republic Scientific and Technological Center of Ukrainian SSR Gosagroprom and the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, the Kiev Trade-Economics Institute, and the All-Union Scientific Center for Radiation Medicine of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences have been conducting combined research on this problem since 1986. This research effort has been successfully concluded. Effective processes have been submitted to industry for producing full-value meat products which, thanks to special microadditives containing certain biologically active substances, acquire the capability to reduce accumulation in the system of radionuclides which are harmful to health and to remove them from the system.

Consumption of such food products greatly reduces absorption into the blood of radioactive cesium and radioactive strontium which have entered the body. Just what are these wonder products? Blood sausage, liver sausage, Starokyivska blood pudding, Desna liver paste, and Tonizuyucha boiled sausage.

Preparation process standards documentation has been prepared for the new products, in coordination with the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Health. They are in no way

inferior in nutritional and biological value to traditional food items. Economic calculations indicate that their manufacture will be highly profitable.

When will these new products appear on store shelves? That depends on how soon the USSR Ministry of Medical Industry can set up production of a special complexer at a vitamin plant, how soon the USSR Ministry of Fish Industry can obtain sodium alginate from the Arkhangelsk Seaweed Processing Combine, and how soon Ukrainian SSR Gosagroprom sets up production at meat processing combines.

A few days ago Ukrainian SSR Gosagroprom approved the requisite documentation. At a conference held at the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, which was also attended by manufacturers, they discussed matters connected with further research on the development of radiation-counteracting food products and utilization of obtained research results in production.

Concessions To Chernobyl Hunger Strikers

90UN1301A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
24 Feb 90 p 4

[RATAU report: "The Conflict Has Been Settled"]

[Text] It has already been reported in some of the mass media organs that on 20 February, 18 patients being observed and treated at the clinic of the All-Union Scientific Center for Radiation Medicine in Kiev, declared a hunger strike and made a number of demands. On 21 February, A. I. Kondrusev, the deputy minister of health of the USSR and V. Ya. Voznyak, head of the division on emergencies of the State Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, K.I. Massik deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, members of the government commission on eliminating the consequences of the disaster at the Chernobyl Atomic Energy Station, and Yu. P. Spizhenko Ukrainian SSR minister of health met with them. The leaders of the "The Chernobyl Union" society, a number of officials and specialists from the Center for Radiation Medicine and its clinics also participated in the meeting. The demands that had been made were discussed in detail, as were other issues related to medical care and protection of the civil rights of individuals exposed to radiation as a result of the Chernobyl disaster.

A joint protocol was compiled and specific measures were planned to satisfy the demands made by the patients. It was decided to send a commission to the USSR Academy of Medicine, which has authority over the Center for Radiation Medicine, to check on its activities. Representations of the "Chernobyl Union" society will participate in the work of this commission.

After the meeting, the patients decided to terminate the hunger strike.

**Head of USSR Chernobyl Commission
Interviewed**

90UN1107A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
6 Feb 90 p 2

[Interview with Vitaliy Khuseynovich Doguzhiyev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman and head of the governmental commission on the Chernobyl nuclear accident, conducted by A. Sokol, PRAVDA UKRAINY correspondent: "Chernobyl: Facing Up to the Problems"]

[Text] The areas affected by the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant have once again been visited by a governmental commission. The head of that commission, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman V. Kh. Doguzhiyev, reported that these on-site sessions will be conducted on a regular basis, twice yearly, and that the commission's work will not be done until all questions concerning Chernobyl are settled.

The commission's members were familiarized with the situation at the nuclear power plant and in the "covering" and considered the problems which exist at those places and within the 30-kilometer exclusion zone. Commission members visited the All-Union Scientific Center for Radiation-Related Medicine and talked with patients at its clinic. Frank discussions with residents of "polluted" rayons in Zhitomir and Kiev oblasts were held at the rayon centers Narodichi and Poleskoye.

V. Kh. Doguzhiyev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, was interviewed by our correspondent.

[Correspondent] Vitaliy Khuseynovich, in August of last year, during your first visit, it was difficult for the governmental commission to carry on a dialogue in the "polluted" rayons: the issues raised by Chernobyl are complex and painful ones. What solutions have you since found to the problems that were brought up in August?

[Doguzhiyev] We cannot do everything that was proposed at those meetings all at once. But the government has passed a decree concerning urgent, vital problems.

[Correspondent] What measures does that document propose?

[Doguzhiyev] The government proceeds upon the assumption that the most important thing is people's health and the safety of the places where they live. Therefore more people are presently being evacuated from some population centers. That decision was up to the republic, and it has already been made.

Note: The Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers has decided to evacuate 16 population centers: 13 in Narodichskiy Rayon, Zhitomir Oblast, and three in Poleskiy Rayon, Kiev Oblast. The rayon centers of Narodichi and Poleskoye are included in the list of areas to be evacuated.

Plans have been made to relocate 2,910 families this year.

[Doguzhiyev] Here is one very important aspect of this matter: during meetings with the governmental commission people said that a radiation exposure of 35 rems per lifetime should not be the sole criterion for evacuation. They noted that consideration should also be given to the overall radiation situation, to the quality of food products and other factors. That is the correct approach. Therefore the governmental commission made provision for additional resettlement. If, for instance, restrictions have been placed on some local food product—milk, in most cases—then local residents may leave those areas. The state will compensate those residents for their losses and give them top priority in housing distribution.

[Correspondent] Has a time frame for resettlement been established?

[Doguzhiyev] That is to be determined by the republic on the basis of the specific circumstances and its actual capabilities. The top-priority right to resettlement belongs to families with children under the age of 14, pregnant women and individuals with a doctor's recommendation that they be resettled. I would like to note that it is safe to live in the rayons we are talking about. A bonus of 15 rubles per family member has been instituted for those who wish to remain there.

In accordance with the decree adopted by the government a comprehensive program of medical care and services for those living in "polluted" territory is being drawn up. This work is nearing completion. There is a desire to complete it in the first quarter. I think that will be accomplished.

For what does it make provision? Above all for meeting the demand for medicine. Incidentally, medicines are also being purchased abroad. According to villagers the medicine supply has improved but still falls far short of meeting their needs. And there should be no such shortage. Plans are included to equip all hospitals with modern equipment, all hospitals without exception: oblast, rayon and village hospitals, and even medical stations. A number of affected villages have a shortage of doctors. Some doctors have gotten scared and left; not all the medical school graduates sent to the areas in question arrive at their place of assignment. I think incentives should be provided to encourage medical personnel to work in these areas. The method of having doctors rotate in and out is obviously unacceptable. Nor is there any need for it.

The government decree pays special attention to the problem of children. This problem is acute, concerns many people and is being resolved on a broad scale, encompassing medical observation, nutrition, recreation, therapy and, of course, treatment. From now on trips to sanatoria will be issued not only by the VTSPS [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], but also by labor collectives, up to five percent of the total number issued. Free meals have been introduced at kindergartens and general education schools.

[Correspondent] Did that not exist previously?

[Doguzhiyev] It did, but only in areas under strict monitoring, where radiation pollution was over 15 curies per square kilometer. Now the benchmark is five curies. This encompasses an incomparably larger area.

Other benefits have also been introduced. For example, persons who work in the zone of strict monitoring will be on the second pension list.

[Correspondent] What does that mean?

[Doguzhiyev] That means that men will retire at age 55, and women at age 50. In order to get this one must have the appropriate job history or have lived under certain conditions for a certain period, 12.5 and 10 years, respectively. The procedures for applying this pension system must be better defined, it is true. People have commented at meetings that we should not ignore the time that has passed since the accident, the years which preceded this decree. That makes sense.

Note: The new benefits include the following: longer paid leave for pregnant women, up to three months before the birth of a child and up to three years for the purpose of caring for a child; a 25-percent raise for both retirees and those still working; and lifting of the current wage "ceiling" for those who continue to work.

[Doguzhiyev] There is something else I should add. The government decree makes provision for the production of all the dosimetric instruments currently in use—personal devices, wide-area monitoring devices, and devices used to test for radioactivity in food products. Last year we produced 1,500 such instruments, and this year's total will be 100,000. I think that we will overcome the problem with the supply of these instruments sometime this year.

Those who are living in "polluted" areas are interested in getting natural gas service. Their concern is understandable. Ash from locally-harvested firewood and peat concentrates radioactivity. A program has been developed to attach homes to the natural gas system at an accelerated rate.

Those are the key features of the government's decree.

[Correspondent] Recently there has been lively discussion on how to increase the effectiveness of recovery efforts. Specifically, toward this end it has been proposed that a special state organ be established and that it should operate under a unified program with centralized planning and material-technical supply. What do you have to say about that?

[Doguzhiyev] The USSR Supreme Soviet has decided to develop a unified union-republic program to clean up the effects of the Chernobyl nuclear accident. We have been working on this document since last year. At the end of February we submitted it to the USSR Council of Ministers, and in March to the Supreme Soviet. At the same time we reported on the current situation.

The program is designed as follows. First the republics—the Ukraine, Belorussia and Russia—submitted their own plans. A general plan of action was compiled on the basis of those plans. Matters which must be resolved at the union level and which concern all regions were placed under the jurisdiction of the Union; those which do not require a state-wide decision were left to the republics. Beginning in 1991 Chernobyl will form a separate section in the economic plan. In this way existing material-technical supply problems will be solved.

I would like to note that the republics' programs were submitted late. Work on them continues through the joint efforts of the center and the republics. We have observed a sort of competition between regions, in which they are planning jobs which are in no way connected with the accident. For example, the Belorussian plan proposes renovation of the entire railway system, construction of a hotel in Minsk and colossal outlays—17 billion rubles. Our economic difficulties are common knowledge, and we cannot agree to a plan of this nature. As for the funds required for Chernobyl directly, those funds will be allocated.

Coordination of the proposed work and monitoring of it will be carried out by our governmental commission. In the Ukraine and Belorussia these matters will be handled by a republic council of ministers deputy chairman.

[Correspondent] Vitaliy Khuseynovich, what are your comments on planned measures to redistribute "spheres of influence" in the "polluted" regions? An unhealthy tendency in that direction has been observed. Kiev Oblispolkom, for example, has proposed that the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry—the most competent organization—be assigned all the evacuated territory, which as you are aware extends out beyond the limits of the 30-kilometer zone. The ministry is attempting to retain control over only a portion of this zone, the more narrowly-defined expropriation zone. The decision reached on this matter could have an effect on the quality of decontamination efforts and other work.

[Doguzhiyev] A decision in that regard was made long ago: the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry is in charge of the whole 30-kilometer zone. The matter is no longer up for discussion. But the zone should not be defined with a compass circle, but instead by the degree of "pollution" in each locality. Therefore efforts have been made to define the boundary more clearly, with the consent of the republics and the ministry. Unfortunately we have not yet reached a mutually acceptable agreement. We will arrive at such an agreement in the near future.

[Correspondent] The resettlement planned for the Ukraine this year will cost 175 million rubles. A total of 30 million has been allocated from the union budget for this purpose, plus 145 million from the republic budget. How does one account for this ratio?

[Doguzhiyev] It should not be calculated like that.

[Correspondent] How else?

[Doguzhiyev] Overall expenditures should be taken into account. If one does that one finds that 11 billion rubles have been expended out of the state budget already. The following circumstance should also be kept in mind: Belorussia has accumulated a number of pressing problems, thus more funds were allocated to it. The reverse could be true in the future.

[Correspondent] Just like last year the governmental commission has traveled to the scene and heard many requests and complaints from the public. Is any response planned at the governmental level?

[Doguzhiyev] I would like to stress one thing: we will strive to provide necessary benefits and assistance measures to all groups of citizens connected with Chernobyl in any way. The government has already made decisions on the majority of issues pertaining to those living in the "polluted" areas. We have already discussed that. Next in line are those who helped clean up in the aftermath of the accident, those who suffered the most. There are both invalids and hospital patients among this group. The initial measures taken in regard to them have already proven insufficient. New ones are required. In this connection special meetings have been held with veterans of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant and members of the public. This kind of contacts and on-site study of the situation help us take all factors into consideration. We will submit proposals concerning additional benefits for those who took part in recovery efforts to the government within this quarter.

[Correspondent] Our country now has a "Chernobyl League," a public organization whose purpose is to defend the interests of those who suffered from the accident. What is your personal opinion of this organization?

[Doguzhiyev] I met in Chernobyl with representatives of that group on more than one occasion. Were you there?

[Correspondent] Yes.

[Doguzhiyev] Then you probably got a feel for my attitude toward this organization.

I will repeat what I said at our meetings: the documents sent by the "Chernobyl League" to the government touch on timely issues. But they also contain points with which we cannot agree. There are some declarative statements in there. Decisions have already been made in regard to some of the issues raised. I submit that the problems caused by Chernobyl should be resolved by working together, not in a situation where some people are on one side of the barricades, with others outside opposing them. If you have been paying attention, and you probably have, today many people are outraged and saying "Why were things done in such-and-such a way instead of some other way?" We hear voices calling for those responsible to be brought to justice. It is not just at work that no single person is responsible, but in real life as well. What is happening is that this fruitless rhetoric and hubbub are pushing aside urgent, immediate tasks.

What is my point? If an organization is formed for the purpose of, say, attempting to help the victims, one which wanted to help get people's lives back to normal, then how could one not be in favor of such an organization? Representatives of the "Chernobyl League" have reported that they intend to sponsor an all-union voluntary Saturday workday and turn over the money raised to the victims of Chernobyl. What is my attitude toward such a noble goal? Purely positive.

The problems caused by Chernobyl will not disappear tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow. And the whole country must work to solve them. But regional efforts must be added to these common efforts. Organizations, both state and public, should also pitch in and work together.

Glasnost Still Lacking in Ukrainian Literature, History

90UN0939A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 17 Jan 90 p 3

[Article by Ivan Dzyuba: "What We See on the Horizon. Our Nation's Cultural Heritage: How Do We See It and What Is It Really?"]

17 Jan 90, p 3

[Text] It has been a few years now since the first cautious discussions of "blank spots" in the history of the culture of the Soviet peoples began to turn into a more genuine and broader examination of more than just "spots" as such—whether blank/white, black, or bloody—but rather the question of the completeness of historical and cultural memory; of returning to the peoples all the spiritual values created by preceding generations and then taken away, falsified or hushed up for over a half century; of a more mature and comprehensively perceptive attitude of society toward the cultural heritage. The deepening sense of that realization—of the necessity of returning to alienated spiritual values—has gone hand in hand with genuine craving for them on the part of readers and viewers, assimilation and interpretation in esthetic awareness and thoughts on current events. It is to be hoped, then, that the way will be found toward new cultural awareness and new spiritual realization.

Both sides of the process—theoretical realization of the problem of "unsealing" national spiritual treasures, and practical offering of the safeguarded texts and objects to the people—can be observed here in the Ukraine. (Just as in the related re-evaluation of the pattern of one's national culture in general, of more faithful perception of it.) Yet the magnitude, the forms, and the pace of this process are so far quite different from what is taking place in Russian culture or, for example, in the culture of the Baltic peoples.

And so our literary and artistic journals have finally got around to publishing particular works by V. Vynnychenko, M. Hrushevskyy, Dm. Yavornytsky, Mykola Khvylyovyy, and certain Ukrainian emigre writers. The Ukrainian Writers' Union and the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Institute of Literature, in collaboration with the republic's Goskomizdat, have worked out a solid long-range plan to publish the works of authors who were repressed, discriminated against, or "forgotten." The first harbingers have already appeared—V. Pidmohylnyy's novel "The City," the works of the "molodomuzivtsy," a Dm. Falkivskyy collection titled "The Solar Machine" and V. Vynnychenko's stories for children, Les Kurbas's theoretical works, and a number of other publications. Fuller editions of the works of certain authors who were "returned" to us in the 1950s and 1960s have come out (Ye. Polishchuk, Hr. Kosynka, M. Dray-Khmara, V. Polishchuk and others). Others have been prepared and will soon appear.

And yet.... It has taken us too long to "pluck up our courage." We are still "just getting started." Even worse, substantial items from the confiscated treasury of Ukrainian literature that are now appearing in the periodical press are not attracting as much reader interest as one might wish. Also proceeding at too slow a pace, and along too narrow lines, is the professional literary-critical processing of revived literary holdings, as well as work on the formulation of a new concept of the history of Ukrainian literature, to say nothing of a refurbishing of its image in the mass consciousness.

Expressions of alarm in regard to this are not lacking, but this understandably emotional dissatisfaction does not help things much, any more than the usual complaints about our alleged lethargy, clumsiness, and chronic lateness in the acquisition of historical benefits. National self-criticism is an important and valuable thing, but it is more essential in spheres of application rather than in subjective character-reading.

The narrowness and obvious retardation of the process of "regeneration" of our national culture, in particular the publicization, reception, and interpretation of our confiscated literary heritage of the past and of recent years, is to be accounted for, in my opinion, by a great number of circumstances. Consider, for example, that the icebound stratum of Stalinism-Brezhnevism in the Ukraine was thicker than anywhere else, and that the ideological thaw started later and did not take place as rapidly as one might wish. Consider the uncertain status of national culture in the Ukraine, which in effect finds itself in the position of something that is supplementary, optional so to speak, responsibility for which on the level of state structures is purely a formality. Consider the disgraceful inadequacy of the republic's printing plants (and even they, to a large extent, are used to meet the needs of the Central departments) and the perennial shortage of paper. Consider the lack of researchers, textologists, original source experts, and other specialists—hence the inadequacy of fundamental research, the archival-documentary base, original source holdings, and prepared texts; the scale of specialist training in the republic is terribly low.

The VUZs of the Ukraine have never (with the exception of a brief period in the 1920s) seen their task as that of educating a strong contingent of people educated in the humanities, well versed in the genuine riches and problematics of Ukrainian culture, firmly convinced of its vital necessity to the life of the nation, capable of working fruitfully and selflessly in that "unpromising field." Such people, of course, did not die out (even after the mass extermination of them in the 1930s and numerous persecutions that came after), but it was despite official doctrine and instruction. Consider, finally, the alienation of a substantial portion of the people from their own culture and language as a result of the lengthy and deliberately planned actions of numerous social-political, social-economic, ideological, and other factors which led to the blocking of many arteries that would nourish the culture, flowing from the

people to the culture and from the culture to the people, which led to an impoverishment of cultural needs and resulted in comparatively low demand for those things which might be proposed today....

When it comes to the subject of the loss of the past, naturally, public attention is focused primarily on the "Great Terror" of the 1930s and on the relatively smaller magnitude of the destructive periods that came before and after. But then the public's attention turns to items that were not confiscated as a result of the physical Terror but rather the ideological Terror, branded and "condemned" from the standpoint of ideological intolerance or political aggression. Finally, a third group of literary items that were destined to long-term oblivion consisted of those that were the victims of impoverished spiritual interests, "simplistic" tastes, and indeed ordinary lack of interest, laziness, and forgetfulness. The decline of culture is always retroactive, so to speak; the cultural heritage becomes "inaccessible" and looks impoverished. And he who is not free in present actions is not free in the mastery of the past. A society of absolute social manipulation also manipulates its own past, trimming and pruning it to suit its own character and convenience.

Here in the Ukraine, these three categories of loss were shaped under the influence of both general, Soviet factors, and by extraordinarily pronounced, specific factors embodied in the Ukrainian (rather, anti-Ukrainian) policies of Stalin, Khrushchev, Suslov, and Brezhnev. By that I mean, primarily, the ideologically idiotic "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" syndrome (the Stalinist version of the "Mazeppa" or "separatist" syndrome of the Russian tsars). For years, for decades, the exaggerated anti-Ukrainian psychosis not only intensified the consequences of the overall "Great Terror" but also resulted in a tragically distorted, wretchedly narrow view of all Ukrainian history and culture; it led to a psychopathic, sectarian distrust and brutal, police-style selectivity in regard to its values.

The overall tendency to impart an anti-cultural (surrogate) direction to culture in the Ukraine was abetted and intensified by a striving to give Ukrainian culture the sort of scope and character that would result in its working to cause both itself and the Ukrainian nation in general to wither away. Precisely herein lay the profoundest sense of the theory and practice of the merging of nations and cultures, which, in the initial stage, called for the ignoral or "erasure" of differences among them. Viewed as the ideal was a situation (which was implacably and successfully implemented!) in which Ukrainian culture and the Ukrainian language would be needed only as a means of fighting against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism"—actually, against the foundations of the people's national existence—and a knowledge of the Ukrainian language would become the prerogative of those working in the official organs.

This is why we in the Ukraine have lost not only what everyone else did but also a great deal that exceeded the

all-Union obligatory "norm." How many literatures, for example, can "boast" that even the officially sanctified classics have not been safe from official depredations? How can we imagine ad hoc [konyunkturny] pruning of the text in Pushkin, Lermontov, Tolstoy, Chekhov, Raynis, Chavchavadze, Abovyan, and others whose every word is "protected by law"?

In the Ukraine, even the classics were defenseless against the ideological bone-breakers. To this day, we do not find among the published works of Lesya Ukrayinka the drama "The Noblewoman," and in many publications the poem "And Thou Too Fought in Former Times, Like Israel" was missing—just because in this verse the poet associates the Ukraine's national bondage (pre-Revolutionary, of course) with the Babylonian Captivity and the fate of the Jewish people. One sought in vain in the collected works of Olha Kobylanska for the novel "The Black Apostle," which concerns the national-political aspirations of the West Ukrainian intelligentsia early in the 20th century. A number of Ivan Franko's poetic and political texts were not printed; in particular, we were "protected" against his critical reflections concerning the absolutization of certain of the dogmas of Marxism—reflections which, unfortunately, have proved prophetic.... Finally, it was not until last year, after a long interval, that the mass reader obtained the complete text of Taras Shevchenko's "Kobzar"; for many years it was adulterated by the exclusion of a number of national-political works that would be "offensive" to those who looked upon the history of the Ukraine through the eyes of the Russian tsars.

In general, the history of the Ukraine is one of the most fascinating aspects of European and world history; yet in our country it has been treated virtually as a peripheral adjunct to Russian history. It has been reduced essentially to the most recent period and is confined to a few readings in chrestomathies. In an especially pernicious and crafty manner it is missing the social models and values which enriched—or could have enriched—world experience in people's democratic self-organization. Essentially missing from Ukrainian history and the history of Ukrainian culture, for example, is the reality of the religious-cultural brotherhoods in the towns of the 16th and 17th centuries, which played a decisive role in the Ukrainian nation's spiritual self-defense against the Catholic aristocracy's expansion and authenticated the uniqueness of the social-cultural structure of Ukrainian society. Short shrift is given to a most epochal phenomenon in the life of the Ukrainian nation—the Zaporozhye Cossack settlements, a unique social-political and moral phenomenon which left a profound stamp in the mind and memory of the people and made a long-lasting influence on the nation's democratic ideals, folk poetry and arts. [Official history] has greatly denigrated and besmirched the Hetmanate, which, while admittedly imperfect and full of contradictions, was certainly a more democratic form of national statehood than tsarism, and it also left a noticeable stamp on the national consciousness and in literary monuments. Similarly,

patriotic and freedom-loving motifs in folk poetry and written literature that are linked to those aspects of the nation's history have been neglected. It is certain that all of this has resulted in impoverishment of the spiritual sphere.

18 Jan 90, p 4

[Text] It is for that same reason—fear of free national-political thinking—that we took pains to avoid the broad ideological field of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, an organization of advanced Ukrainian intelligentsia of the 1840s. It would have been impossible to completely bypass Taras Shevchenko's involvement in it, but authentic documents and materials have yet to be published, and a collection of documents in three volumes, prepared in the 1960s, has never come out (although plans are now underway again)—even the well-known "Books of the History of the Ukrainian Nation" have not been published here, and are practically inaccessible to anyone except academic specialists.

Meanwhile, the ideology of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood—especially its left wing—constituted an extraordinarily interesting transformation of European republicanism and Polish messianism, enriched and transformed by the democratic experience of the Cossack period of Ukrainian history and the liberating ideals of the Ukrainian people, and it was a radically new direction in determining the paths of Slavic renaissance and community life. Rejecting any orientation either toward the Russia of Nicholas or toward the Austria-Hungary of the Habsburgs, the members of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood put forth a plan for the voluntary union of free Slavic nations in a federation of republics having equal rights. It is essential to properly evaluate the boldness and democratic nature of the Brotherhood's political thinking, which was more than merely ahead of its time. Researchers are now returning to the theme, but it needs to benefit the entire cultural community rather than just a narrow circle of specialists. Making the appropriate texts and documents broadly available and the object of study in the VUZs (and in the schools too) in order to increase public awareness of them would greatly enhance our understanding of the intellectual history of the Ukraine, substantially change its spiritual "map," and would foster the development of a healthy national self-awareness.

In general it must be acknowledged that great numbers of important documents of national-political thought in our country have been deliberately and purposefully taken out of circulation or passed over in silence. For example, works of Trokhym Zinkivskyy such as "The National Question in Russia," "Young Ukraine," "Stund," and others, have not been published in the Soviet period. Also inaccessible to today's readers are many of B. Hrinchenko's popular science, current affairs, and artistic works—in particular such studies as "Before the World at Large" and the polemical "Letters

From the Eastern/Dnepr Ukraine"—and I. Nechuy-Levytskyy's pamphlet "The Ukraine at Moscow's Summons"; and others. Even the works of Ukrainian economists of the Marxist or near-Marxist persuasion (S. Podolynskyy and others) have never been republished during the Soviet era. In particular, the Ukrainian economist M. Tuhan-Baranovskyy, who is known to us only through hearsay as a "legitimate Marxist," left a noteworthy legacy to world economic science, and his works are still highly regarded among specialists in the West. The works of two outstanding Ukrainian philosophers of the 19th century, P. Yurkevych and V. Lesevych, remain inaccessible and unstudied.

The intellectual life of the Ukraine has been sorely afflicted by the fact that the fruitful labors of three great workingmen and thinkers have long been excluded from it: M. Kostomarov, P. Kulish, and M. Drahomanov. And even though they are now being published, it is only a miserly portion of their scientific legacy. Also rather astonishing is the treatment of numerous representatives of the social-political thinking of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, up to and including even persons who have been praised highly as democrats, progressives, and associates of Franko—M. Pavlyk and O. Terletskyy, for example. They have been highly praised, all right, but not published; and we're not publishing them yet (the little one-volume collection of M. Pavlyk's belles-lettres does not solve the matter of consideration of him as a political thinker). This is all quite apart from documents concerning the social-political struggle in the Ukraine in the first, second, and third decades of the 20th century, or the literature of memoirs, which reflected the social and cultural life of that period from the "alien" point of view (for example, the diaries and reminiscences of Yevhen Chykalkenko). Doomed to oblivion or simply crossed out was the cultural activity of many people who were not only "nationalistically" but even merely democratically oriented, such as, for example, Khrystyna Alchevska and Sofiya Rusova.

In addition to losses brought about by the deliberate and categorical censorship of the classical heritage, there were (and, strictly speaking, still are) losses caused by "softer" factors such as excessive caution, suspicion, "mismanagement" of culture, laziness, apathy, and total lack of interest in the state of the national spirit. And, finally, the legacy of of political and ideological circumstances which gave rise to an overall impoverishment of society's aggregate spiritual wants.

One of the half-forgotten bulwarks of Ukrainian culture that can be named is the broad and important body of works of a brilliant constellation of humanities scholars at Kharkov University (O. Potebnya and his students M. Sumtsov, D. Bahaliy, D. Ovsyaniko-Kulykovskyy, O. Yefymenko, O. Rusov, I. Maslov, I. Khalanskyy, H. Hirshman, V. Buzeskul, M. Pavlovskyy and others). Let us recall, in addition, early 19th-century Kharkovians such as V. Karamzin, Ye. Filomafitskyy, R. Honorskyy, and I. Sreznhevskyy—even just a portion of their works

would be worthwhile to publish in a special historical-literary collection, in order thereby to return to the public's awareness an important link in the development of scientific and civic thought.

And consider the upsurge in the cultural and scientific life of Galicia in the late 19th and early 20th centuries! Between 1892 and 1917, the Shevchenko Association in Lvov published 120 volumes of scientific "Transactions," 35 volumes of the "Ethnographic Collection," 14 volumes of "Materials in Ukrainian Ethnology," 15 volumes of collections in the historical-philosophy section, and the same number in the philology section.

When you consider that all this was done without any state support whatever, counting exclusively on voluntary work and donations, you can only marvel at the energy of the national-cultural development of our people. And the scientific quality of those publications still today can serve as an example for academic institutions. Isn't it time to think about reprinting at least the most valuable of them, or putting together a kind of multi-volume anthology? The same thing applies to materials of KIYEVSKAYA STARINA, which came out from 1882 through 1907, and UKRAYINA, the journal of the Ukrainian Science Association that was formed in Kiev in 1906. All of these are scattered and inaccessible, require painstaking study and research, and—most of all—republishing. Then all kinds of blank spots in the intellectual history of the Ukraine will be filled in; we will see how persistently our national culture has regenerated after all the mortal blows it has suffered, how much effort it has made to assert and fulfill itself, and what unique aspects of the people's spirit it has brought to light.

I have named just a few of the facts and phenomena of pre-Revolutionary Ukrainian culture which have, for various reasons, "been omitted" from today's cultural awareness and are being only partially restored to it. But even from this partial inventory we can see clearly how oversimplified, "glossed over," and bleached-out the picture of the nation's pre-Revolutionary spiritual life has become. But the pseudo-class world-ordering axe had an even more devastating effect on the literary process of the first years of Soviet rule, which, because of the multiplicity of their social-cultural content, proved to be unacceptable to the militant state prejudices of the period of Stalinism. Incidentally, that aspect of the theme is relatively well known by now. The painful term "executed renaissance" has become a solid part of public awareness.

But the general public is much less aware of the "suffocated renaissance" of the late 1950s and early 1960s. The arrests of 1965 and 1972 and the "quiet" repressions of later years led to grievous consequences—crippled careers, books that were withdrawn or never published, works never printed, a decline in creative thinking, the menacing growth of conformism. At long last, delayed by a quarter-century, in 1988 a poetry collection by Vasyl Holoborodko finally appeared—a poet who in the early

1960s launched a new wave in our poetry and was published in many European and other languages. Mykhayl Sachenko and Valeriy Illya had to wait almost as long, Mykola Vorobyov and Viktor Kordun somewhat less—all representatives of the so-called Kiev School of Poets. Unpublished to this day are Borys Mamaysur, Mykhaylo Hryhoriv, and the late Hryhoriy Tymenko—yet each of them represents a fascinating, unique phenomenon in the Ukrainian poetry of the 1960s through the 1980s. For many years our people have attempted to rehabilitate and publish the legacy of Vasyl Stus, who died in the camps of Mordvinia and was a crystalline-honest man and one of the most talented Ukrainian poets of our time. Finally, the first publications are at hand. We are waiting for publication of a book worthy of that poet—just as we are waiting for editions of Ivan Svitlychnyy, Yevhen Sverstyuk, and Vasyl Ruban. And how long yet are we going to neglect Ihor Kalynets, the author of a number of brilliant little books which, unfortunately, were not published here, a man who produced a new type of intellectual poetry drawing upon the symbols and mythology of Ukrainian life in its historical dimensions? How about Vasyl Borovyv and Mykola Danko, who were discriminated against just because of someone's extraordinary zeal? These are just a few names in literature, quite apart from losses in painting, music, cinema, and the sciences—all need to become the object of special discussion.

Today we are in possession of just a portion of what has been created by the efforts of many generations of people working in our national culture. And even the totality of what is still inaccessible to us, in turn, is just a portion of "what might have been" if the lines of development could have been fully realized rather than broken off by force, often at their very inception. We can only attempt to imagine **what our culture might have been** if it had developed normally to the extent of the people's creative forces. But it is impossible to imagine, much less reconstruct, that hypothetical state. Something else, however, is within our power: to at least revive and return to the people what has in fact been created, what does in fact exist but has been withdrawn in various forms and to various extents. The effort has already been started, but it needs to take on truly national scope and scale.

But restoration of the heritage will mark just the first stage of its assimilation. In addition it will have to be properly perceived by society, and the intellectual demand for it will have to be vigorous. Further, in-depth scientific and critical study of everything that is restored—first, in terms of its place in the intellectual life and cultural process of its own time, next in terms of its ability to live in our consciousness today.

Assimilation of our revived heritage will change the image of our culture not only in our own eyes but also in the eyes of other peoples, the eyes of the cultural world. In particular, it will help us to overcome the inferiority complex which has hampered us politically, economically, and culturally in past times. It will help us to see the true spiritual and intellectual potential of our nation,

to liberate ourselves from the stereotypes that burden people's ideas about Ukrainian culture and literature. But these are themes for another discussion.

'Aprel' Writers Group Reform Program Issued

90UN1264A Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian No 10, 9 March 90 p 2

["Platform of the 'Aprel' All-Union Writers' Association ('Writers in Support of Perestroika')"]

[Text] In the RSFSR Writers' Union

The All-Union Writers' Association, "Aprel" (Writers in Support of Perestroika), being established within the framework of the USSR Writers' Union, has set the following aims and goals for itself:

1. Socio-Political

Active support for the popular movement for a cardinal - NOT JUST IN WORD BUT IN DEED - restructuring of our society.

This means:

Consistent protection of the working people's interests in all spheres of life.

Resolute renunciation of the totalitarian-bureaucratic system.

The dismantling of all command and administrative structures in state and public life.

Support for all types of multi-structured economy, oriented towards a free development of market relations.

Abolition of monopoly and its consequences in all spheres of political, economic, ideological and spiritual life of society.

Protection of human rights, freedom of consciousness, the freedom of expression, a plurality of public and political stands as the base for society's normal life (ruling out the propaganda of violence, racial and national discord, of all types of discrimination along social, national or any other lines).

Establishment of a rule-of-law state that would reliably guarantee by law all the above mentioned principles as well as all individual rights.

Complete democratization of society, based on the principles of direct and equal elections of all public institutions. Placing all government structures, including the Army, the KGB, and the MVD under the control of organs of people's power.

Restoration of the destroyed and neglected national cultural values of all nations inhabiting our country. Developing respect for all national shrines.

We resolutely condemn the position taken by the board of the RSFSR Writers' Union and by some organs of the press under its jurisdiction, which sow intra-ethnic discord.

2. Ideological-Aesthetical

Unification of all progressive forces in our literature.

We understand progressiveness to include not just the public and political program outlined above, but as an emphasis on the complete freedom of artistic quest, competition among any creative styles, involvement in the world literary process, absence of any creative monopoly and normative regulations in the area of artistic world outlook and the search for creative forms.

The USSR Writers' Union is known to have been established following the disbanding of all writers' associations that existed prior to 1934, the abolition of all literary schools and trends. The Writers' Union Statutes made it incumbent on all writers in the country to follow not only the same political platform, but the same creative method.

We advocate not only political but also creative pluralism, which makes it possible to establish creative groups within our association which would have their own specific artistic platforms.

3. Organizational-Creative

Remaining within the framework of the USSR Writers' Union, we set ourselves the goal of reforming it.

The old structure of the Writers' Union has been misaligned long ago with the new democratic forms of today's both public and state life in the country.

The Writers' Union should be re-established on a fundamentally new organizational and structural basis.

We conceive this new structure as a federation uniting independent associations along not only territorial, national and genre principles, but on the principle of ideological and creative affinity, and common artistic aspirations. The hierarchal ("pyramid-type") structure of the present Writers' Union should be completely eliminated. Direct, equal and democratic elections to all self-governing bodies should be guaranteed.

The Writers' Union is called upon to campaign to ensure the best possible conditions to enable writers to engage in creative work, the observation of their copyright and giving them an opportunity to have their works published. The Union should exist with the aim of protecting the civic and professional dignity of the writer, his right of free creativity, exercised in all spheres without any ideological, language, subject, genre, style or other restrictions; the protection of social, economic, legal, and other rights of its members, protection of, and support for young literary workers.

We oppose the monopoly on publishing in our country, which results in stagnation, book shortages and creates a bureaucratic wall separating the writer and the reader. We support the development and perfection of cooperative, stock and all other forms of publishing. State-run publishing houses will be able to eradicate their old and incurable ailments only by competing with the former.

We also set the goal of reforming the USSR Literary Fund, turning it into an independent public organization in the full sense of the word, an organization that would strictly follow the principle of justice in its entire activity, paying greatest attention to those who needs this most of all. The Literary Fund should be based on the same democratic principles, as the renovated Writers' Union.

These are the main goals to be pursued by the association that we are establishing.

We call upon all those sharing our concern about the state of affairs in the country and in the Writers' Union and who have affinity with the principles outlined to join us.

The text of the "Platform" draft has been submitted for familiarization by the secretariat of the USSR Writers' Union.

RSFSR Writers Union Comments on 'Aprel' Program

90UN1264B Moscow *LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA*
in Russian No 10, 9 March 90 p 2

[Unattributed article: "From the Secretariat of the RSFSR Writers' Union"]

[Text] This is just a draft "Platform" so far, of course. It can become an acting program of what is now the All-Union "Aprel" in a few days if the plenum of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union gives its consent to the "Aprel" members holding their conference.

The informal association that emerged within the framework of the Moscow writers' organization a year ago makes public its populist goals and aims, like a political party. As distinct from its previously aggressive and divisive statements, "Aprel" has submitted its "Platform" now, which contains the formulations of rare vagueness. But even in its veiled form, it includes the same call for "dismantling" the writers' union.

Things have become clear at last. Indeed, Moscow "Aprel" has waged a fierce fight against the board of the RSFSR Writers' Union all this time. It opposed the direction which was followed by an away session of the secretariat of the RSFSR Writers' Union in Ryazan (October 1988). It produced a maliciously hysterical memorandum to attack the 6th Plenum (November 1989), so that the Plenum participants had to pass a special resolution in response to that statement. It organized a number of OGONEK articles that condemned

the Plenum across the board. It shamelessly combined a brazen provocation in the Central House of Literary Workers on January 18 with the 6th Plenum of the RSFSR Writers' Union board and published an open letter by "Aprel" Communist members in *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* (No 7, 1990) to the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. This chain of political insinuations ends with the "Platform" which bluntly states that "We resolutely condemn the position taken by the board of the RSFSR Writers' Union and by some organs of the press under its jurisdiction, which sow intra-ethnic discord". Laying the blame at the wrong door, so to speak. But let us refrain from proving who is really sowing intra-ethnic discord. This was stated in the "Letter of Russia's Writers" (*LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA* No 9 1990). The secretariat shares and endorses this realistic position outlined in the "Letter".

It is "Aprel" that has been sowing intra-ethnic discord and schism, initially in the Moscow organization, then in Russia's Writers' Union and now in the USSR Writers' Union as a whole, so that it could harp on this clash of passions and emotions, on the chaos of political and literary opposition, to discredit respected Russian writers, to slap hideous labels on them, to malign and destroy the established creative, publishing and magazines structures of Russia, and, riding the crest of this wave, to try to impose its dictatorial power.

Well, this policy contains nothing new. The same policy of destruction and not that of creation is being pursued by the representatives of the "democratic platform" in the CPSU, members of the "Intraregional" group in the USSR Supreme Soviet and in different regions of the country, representatives of "Democratic Russia" during elections to the republican and local Soviets...The destructive polarization of forces, mutual attacks and recriminations, the waning of creative energy and the useless struggle among species is taking place in all the structures under the banner of perestroika, in reality slowing down and weakening perestroika in all spheres of life of society.

Moreover, these destructive forces shamelessly use any means, are capable of vilifying any healthy associations and trends, of falsehoods, perfidy, garbling "semi-truth" instead of the truth; they lack moral principles and criteria; delicacy does not exist for them; people of all nationalities are often taken aback by their onslaught.

This situation gives rise to the question of dissociation and making an open criticism of the populist "platforms", so as to unmask the divisive activity of such informal associations, which is couched in "revolutionary phraseology".

The secretariat of the RSFSR Writers' Union board invites all Russia's writers to become familiar with the "internationalist" position taken by new "proletarian culture" members, with their socio-political and ideological-aesthetical aims and goals, where national artistic

talents are again offered a shameless diktat from the monopolized literary "esthetes".

Under these circumstances, the secretariat believes that the situation in the Writers' Union of Russia can be made healthier only through an ultimate clarification of the relationship with the "Aprel" members, and it submits this issue for consideration by the forthcoming plenum of the RSFSR Writers' Union board on March 29 of this year, with the congress subsequently taking up this matter.

The secretariat rejects "Aprel"'s political and ideological blackmail and diktat, its aggressive attacks against the RSFSR Writers' Union board, and its destructive "Platform". It urges all writers of Russia to express their viewpoint.

It is not through our fault that the schism has taken place; we have been patient and benevolent long enough, but there is a limit to everything. The limit has been reached. We suggest that "Aprel" members make their choice for the sake of life, full-fledged, benevolent, equal and mutually respectful creative work, for the sake of lofty professional relations in literary milieu.

Let us have a smaller membership, but we shall have instead a healthier and better moral, creative and professional situation in our Russian union.

Writers Union Rejects Karpov Resignation Request

90UN1271A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Article by V. Malukhin: "On the Charter, Congress and Retirement: Report From the Plenum of the USSR Writers Union"]

[Text] On March 16, a plenary meeting of the board of the USSR Writers Union was held in the Central Writers Building. Since a quorum was not present, it was decided to consider the writers meeting a de facto quorum and follow it up by having the decisions made by the secretariat "ratified" through the mails. The agenda included two issues: discussion of the draft of the new edition of the USSR Writers Union Charter and the convocation of the 9th Congress of Soviet writers. Before the work of the plenum was completed, yet another question arose—concerning the request by V. Karpov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union, to be relieved of his authority, but that will be discussed in due course.

Let us begin with the fact that entry into the Central Writers Building had been placed under the control of a reinforced detachment of policemen, which could not help but give rise to the expectation that something extraordinary was going to happen. However, the writers plenum took place in an atmosphere that was unusually peaceful for these walls. The writers considered and discussed the second version of the draft Charter for

their organization. (The first version, which was published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and came in for some sharp criticism, had been renounced as a document exclusively in the tradition of stagnant thinking.) In the opinion of many who spoke, after additional work the new draft, which is more democratic in spirit, has the potential for avoiding a schism in the writers' community, and for transforming the present "ministry of literature" into a truly creative, free, and functional association of writers.

There was a serious concern within the secretariat of the Writers Union board that a whole series of writers organizations from the minority republics would refuse to participate in the work of the current plenum. However, as Yu. Verchenko informed the meeting, there were no "absent" republics. Evidently, the temporary agreement between the USSR Writers Union and the independent Writers Union of Lithuania, which instituted new principles of interaction between the all-union and republic organizations and was signed in November of last year, played a role here.

As for the new Charter of the USSR Writers Union, after further work, it will be presented for approval to the 9th Congress of Writers. The congress is planned for the second quarter of the coming year (tentatively in April). The standards for representation have been established—one delegate for every 12 members of the USSR Writers Union, this will mean approximately 800 participants.

One of the noteworthy reports heard at the plenum was A. Rybakov's information that, by decree of the USSR Council of Ministers of 25 February of the current year, the unofficial "International PEN-Club" writers association will henceforth be legally represented in the USSR by the national PEN-centers. Such centers already exist in Moscow in the three Baltic republics, and in the Ukraine, and are in the process of being established in Armenia and Central Asia, while the Belorussian PEN-center is expected to be accepted into the international association at its next regular congress in May.

On the day before the plenum there was a meeting of the secretariat of the USSR Writers Union board, at which F. Burlatskiy, USSR people's deputy and political reviewer for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA was confirmed as the paper's editor-in-chief. On the next day, speaking from the podium of the plenum, Yu. Bondarev proposed (contrary to the regulations currently in effect) to elect an editor of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA at the next congress "who would find a place for all the literatures of our country" and set up an editorial board containing representatives of all the republics. Until that time, he urged that the functions of the editor-in-chief be fulfilled by the first deputy, as "used to be done." This idea, although met with applause, was not put to a vote and was only followed up in one speech.

On the other hand, more than one speaker referred to the so-called "Letter of the 74," published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA (No 9, 1990) by a group of writers and addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the CPSU Central Committee. In particular, Al. Mikhaylov, who sharply attacked the April writers association and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, touched on the issue of such declarations:

"...During the last few months, a number of documents have been published signed by the 'Secretariat of the RSFSR Writers Union.' I ask Sergey Mikhaylov - and the chairman of the board to disown these documents. I, as the first secretary of the 2000-member organization of Moscow writers, a component of the RSFSR Writers Union, and as the secretary of the board did not participate in the writing of these documents. Nor did the working secretaries of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union participate in their drafting. Who are the authors of these documents? A secret society? After all there are approximately 60 people in the secretariat. I read the latter document published in the name of the secretariat and, in essence, foreordaining that there will be a schism of the union, and think about the fates of those writers who do not wish to be dragged into internecine warfare, who want to work in peace and write books. Were they consulted about this? Why should they be pawns in the hands of those who are satisfying their ambitions? Something is rotten in the state of Denmark, in the secretariat of the board of the Russian Writers Union. The chairman of the board and the working secretaries have been virtually barred from decisions concerning important issues. But the secretariat is filling up with new faces. Not long ago, for example, they brought in Yuri Prokushev, whose u73 editorial work for SOVREMENNİK did not end happily and who is now doing editorial work as can be seen here in the plans for the new 5-year period. This however is just a brushstroke in the portrait of the secretariat..."

No commentaries or explanations followed. But on 19 and 20 March the 7th plenum of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union, devoted to the "objectives of the writers of Russia under conditions of national crisis" will be held in the same hall of the Central Writers Building. Evidently, answers will be provided there to questions posed at the all-union plenum.

And finally, the last subject of the day and the one attracting most attention was associated with the retirement request made by the head of the nationwide writers' association, V. Karpov. Briefly giving his biography and mentioning that he had been made editor of NOVYY MIR and then first secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union, he asserted:

"...I have endeavored to preserve the unity of our union, despite terrible pressure from the right and from the left.. I never betrayed anyone, I never let anyone down. By my stubbornness in asserting these positions and my unwillingness to subordinate leadership of the union to any of the forces—on the right or left—I naturally enough

became an impediment in the struggle for power. And in order to rid themselves of this impediment, they have engaged in base slander so as to compromise me, and get me out of here.. Writers [in the past] have defended their colleagues in various ways - writing as individuals and collectively, in collective letters and addresses. Let me mention Tvardovskiy, Zoshchenko, Akhmatova, Solzhenitsyn and dozens of others unjustly accused writers. I do not set myself up as the equal of these outstanding writers in creativity or talent, I know my place in literature. I am a person who writes only on military topics with a very modest talent, and yet I am a human being. I am your first secretary, in whom you placed such great confidence. And yet nobody during these 3 has years once expressed doubt in the filth which was heaped on me. Obviously, you believe it, and if that is the case, then I can no longer be first secretary, of the Writers Union, and I resign from this position."

V. Karpov had in mind the reprinting in Spain, England, and the USSR of the anonymous work signed "The 'Conscience' Group of the Moscow Oblast of the RSFSR Writers Union," and also two articles this year in the paper KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE ("Concerning the Literary Mosaic, Phenomenal Memory, and Variants" in KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE No 7 and "Of Course, It Is Unpleasant, But..." in No 9), in which, as formulated in the "Findings" of the legal commissions of the USSR and RSFSR Writers Unions, also published in KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE, "doubt is expressed in the reliability of the many spoken and printed claims by V. V. Karpov that he was found guilty of anti-Soviet activity and served his sentence in a penal company." In the articles mentioned, it is asserted that he was convicted of a criminal offense.

O. Suleymenov, Yu. Verchenko, I. Stadnyuk, Ch. Aytmanov, and V. Rasputin spoke in support of V. Karpov. They asked him to remain in his post, and referred to the cases of G. Markov, I. Paderin, S. Sartakov, and N. Gorbachev, against whom accusations were also made during their tenure. Then V. Karpov again took the floor. "I am very grateful to you, thank you very much," he said. "As they say, this is very soothing, but I nevertheless, insist on resigning. And here is why. Because all this—everything you said—will be interpreted as 'this literary general Karpov, using his power, organized the whole thing, and is acting coy,' and all this will be turned into a 'game of the Madrid court' and made to look an attempt on my part to exonerate myself. Let me go. Let Gribov fulfill my duties. If I get my breath back, I will return. If not—write an obituary or whatever. But now let me go."

The plenum voted against the resignation, and V. Karpov returned to performance of his duties. The Bureau of the Secretariat of the USSR Writers Union board was assigned to "elucidate the circumstances of the appearance of this article impugning the civic virtue of the first secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union, V. V. Karpov, and to express their opinion in print on this issue."

On Monday, there will be another plenum, of the board of the Writers Union of Russia...

Ryzhkov, Deputies Discuss Financial Problems in Culture

90UN1323A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 24 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by S. Karkhanin: "Priority for Spiritual Matters: USSR People's Deputies Discussed Current Problems of the Nation's Culture at a Meeting with N.I. Ryzhkov"]

[Text] It is likely that in a few years—and this is something which up to now few people have known—the bell tower of Ivan the Great could collapse. Experts have established that its stone "body" has a crack many meters long. People's Deputy Yu. Solovyev, chairman of the board of the USSR Union of Designers, reported this at the meeting and added that even the Moscow Kremlin, a unique monument of Russian architecture, is not being preserved by the state.

To economize on culture and to understand its role only in a consumerist way would mean, in the words of Ch. Aytmatov, chairman of the Commission on Cultural Development Issues of the Council of Nationalities, contributing to the shortage of those qualities of spirituality and civilization in which the roots of many of our current troubles are hidden. And the chairman of the country's Council of Ministers agreed with the writer: it is culture which is capable of becoming a centripetal force bringing people together.

But the facts provide evidence that the situation is extremely disturbing. Literary figures, musicians, actors, and artists who today participate in the work of the Supreme Soviet spoke with pain about the dominating influence of notorious commerce on the screens and concert stages, and about letters from unhappy constituents demanding that we rein in the cooperatives under whose roofs doubtful programs are flourishing. An abundance of examples was cited. A. Razin, a soloist in the Laskovyy May Group presented an ultimatum in Riga: before each concert 9,000 rubles to be paid in addition to the amount previously agreed upon, or the group gathers up its suitcases. He did not receive the money and carried out his threat. It is difficult not to agree with N. Gubenko, the minister of culture, who recounted this disturbing case: it is a genuine racket.

Other cooperative members operate just as shamelessly in exploiting the shortage of paper. Here is one figure: 200 books planned for publication by the children's publishing houses of Russia will not reach young readers in the coming year. The newspaper LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, with a circulation of 258,000, has a paper supply for only 100,000 copies. At the same time, the cooperative rags, the number of which grows from day to day, calmly circulate gossip and anti-Soviet information. If the country truly has only 82 percent of the necessary paper, should we not agree with Deputy T. Minullin, a writer from Tatariya, who proposed at the

meeting that the channels by which paper reaches the cooperatives be closed off, if only temporarily? N. Ryzhkov, noted that the shortage should be eliminated through purchases abroad, but this requires finding 100 million foreign currency rubles. Nonetheless, are the ambitions of those who publish semi-underground pulp fiction not costing the state rather a lot?

Shortages and wastefulness usually go hand in hand. What has caused the circulation of magazines to increase in the current year, sharply reducing state supplies of paper? Here is an example: LITERATURNAYA UCHEBA undertook to print the Gospels, although Aleksiy, the metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod, who spoke at the meeting, noted that the leadership of the Russian Orthodox Church is resolving problems concerning religious literature through its own channels and has not requested assistance in this area. For the sake of the appearance of success among readers is it worth depriving them of 12 million copies of books—for that is how many the publishing houses will not put out due to the artificially inflated circulation of the magazine?

Can it be said that the pursuit of profits in general is not compatible with true culture? The question is not an idle one for with the disordered finances of the state it is difficult for the theater and the cinema to count on subsidies. At the meeting disagreement arose between N. Ryzhkov and N. Gubenko on the subject of selling the "trade mark" of the Bolshoy Theater to a foreign company. In the opinion of the culture minister, the sale is acceptable because it will help the theater materially and does not impose on it any onerous obligations related to its creative work. But the chairman of the Council of Ministers thinks that our Homeland has sacred places which should have nothing to do with commerce...The discussion is not closed; however, it forces us reflect a bit.

The subject of our reflections is the fate of theaters. One of them, the Taganrog, is linked with the life of Chekhov. Also, architecturally it is unique: when it was built 180 years ago, it was modelled on the renowned La Scala of Milan. The building is close to becoming a ruin, and in general half of the theater buildings in the country show a degree of wear which exceeds 50 percent. Of course, this is not a secret to anyone but where are the funds for restoration work to come from? And how can we not pay attention to the desire of Deputy Ye. Dogi, a composer, who said that if we strive to heal our society from within, the Ministry of Culture must become privileged within the government, if only for a period of time.

At the meeting the most difficult part of the conversation, which was characterized by good will as well as adherence to principles, fell to the USSR Minister of Finance, V. Pavlov. It is true that many claims on him were withdrawn when the minister read excerpts from a new version of a draft law on taxes, which will be discussed in the Supreme Soviet next week. The document takes into account the interests of the cultural

organs and the social funds; however it was decided that in the remaining days more work would be devoted to formulations which take into consideration the desires of the deputies who are also cultural figures. But the main, and most fundamental questions of relations between this sector and the state are to be determined in all probability by a Law Concerning Culture—at the meeting almost everyone talked about the fact that a pressing need for the preparation of such a normative act had arisen.

A little more than half a year ago the government leader, in response to criticism from the deputies, reported that he himself intended to be a "curator" of culture within the Presidium of the Council of Ministers. Within that time something has been accomplished. However, the "explosive volley" of problems falling upon the government makes its work extremely difficult: there is a great deal that must be dealt with immediately. In summing up the results of the meeting N. Ryzhkov also expressed his own wishes to the legislators. Within the limits of the new laws the Council of Ministers must have a certain freedom of action in order to regulate those same taxes, taking into account the concrete situation in the country. Nikolay Ivanovich (Ryzhkov) supported the culture minister's proposal for the preparation of a decree to regulate concert activity and to create a Union-wide organ outside the regular agencies which will take upon itself the protection of architectural monuments. "The material facilities of this sector have fallen behind, but the country has genuine schools of talent," that is how the chairman of the Council of Ministers ended his speech. It was decided that contacts between government organs and the commissions of deputies which have jurisdiction over questions of culture must be strengthened in every possible way.

Soviets, Americans Cooperate on Religious 'Fund'

90UN1187A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 11, 14 Mar 90 p 2

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA report: "To Return and Augment..."]

[Text] In Washington, a fund has been established for the resurrection of Russian Christian culture, RISE (in Russian, "Voskhod"). Chairman of the Board of Directors is U.S. citizen and priest of the Russian Church Abroad Viktor Potapov. The fund's president is the publisher of the Moscow journal of Russian Christian culture VYBOR, candidate for RSFSR people's deputy Viktor Aksyuchits. After his return from America we asked him to tell us about the new fund.

"We are trying to support the resurrection of Christian culture, which has suffered unprecedented devastation here and to which to this day glasnost has not truly been extended. We want to return to our compatriots the works of the great Christian philosophers, theologians, publicists, and sociologists of the 20th century. All this, as Sergey Averintsev has noted, is still being doled out in our country in homeopathic doses. The fund intends to

import modern equipment so that we can expand our publishing activity. Our press is going to print books like Solzhenitsyn's 'Gulag Archipelago' as well. Back at the preparatory conference for Memorial two years ago, I spoke proposing publication of 'Gulag' in massive print runs and reinstating Aleksandr Isayevich's citizenship. Now our joint enterprise has managed to accommodate a 100,000 order for this book in Lithuania. The first volume has been published, and the advance of the second has just come out....

"We are planning to participate in the restoration of churches and to render material assistance to modern icon painters, Christian charitable programs, and children's catechism groups. The fund has invited a troupe of Christian actors from Moscow's Ark Theater to tour the United States.

"The funds that are going to be put into the preservation and augmentation of cultural traditions are being collected by Orthodox Russians in diaspora and the Western Christian public.

"One of my strongest impressions from the trip was breakfast with President Bush. It was a so-called prayer breakfast organized once a year by a congressional spiritual fellowship. Leading political figures of the country and foreign guests gather for religious and ethical intercourse. Confessional speeches alternate with the minister's sermons and common prayers. And none of this is directed at any particular political result but rather promotes the formation of an ethically healthy foundation for politics. To be honest, it occurred to me that our politicians would be better able to bring good to the people if they felt an unconditional moral authority over them instead of serving utopian dogmas.

"Americans were very interested in the candidacy for people's deputy not of a priest but of a layman whose election platform was structured around a Christian worldview. Conversations with them confirmed my conviction that this worldview will help create a constructive democratic foundation and more fully express common civic interests. So that I return home with hopes."

Armenian Patriarch Lectures at Pedagogical Institute

90UN1187B Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
1 Mar 90 p 1

[Article by D. Saakyan: "Lecture by Catholicos Vazgen I"]

[Text] "Today I am happy to bestow my blessing and good wishes on the entire collective of the institute..." With these words the Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of all Armenians Vazgen I yesterday began the first lecture of the special course, "The Bible as a Monument

of World Culture," at the V. Bryusov Yerevan Pedagogical Institute of Russian and Foreign Languages [YerPIRiYa].

Joining the head of the Armenian church in the institute's concert hall, were the leader of the Ararat Eparchy, Bishop Garegin, pro-rector of the Echmiadzinskaya Theological Seminary Archimandrite Natan, member of the Armenian church's Supreme Spiritual Council, people's artist of the USSR Grigor Khandzhyan, and general secretary of the charitable organization SOS Armenia, Grigor Papazyan.

Those gathered honored the memory of the victims of violence in Azerbaijan with a minute of silence. The head of the Armenian church told about the sources of the birth of Christianity on the territory of ancient Armenia and the establishment and history of the Armenian church. He noted the great importance of this meeting with students within the walls of the institute, the first ever in all the years he has headed the Armenian church. In conclusion, the Supreme Patriarch wished the entire collective of the institute success in their studies and work and active participation in the processes under way in Armenia.

"The new special course has been introduced into the curriculum at the decision of the Academic Council, based on numerous wishes expressed by teachers and students," said YerPIRiYa's pro-rector for scholarly work Aram Barlezizyan. "It is a part of 'The History and Theory of Religion and Atheism,'" a subject introduced in place of the course on scientific atheism, which did not meet the needs of the present day.

"The special course counts for 20 hours and is intended for third-year students, but all those interested will be allowed to audit. We have asked the Echmiadzinskaya Theological Seminary to help organize the course. And insofar as we were the initiators of this matter, supported by other VUZes as well, we were accorded a great honor: Vazgen I himself expressed his desire to deliver the first lecture.

"Within the framework of the special course students will study the history of the Armenian church and its activity at the present stage. I think that the special course will be most important in educating future pedagogues and philologists."

Council on Religion Created by USSR Academy of Sciences

90UN1187C Moscow *NAUKA I RELIGIYA* in Russian
No 2, Feb 90 pp 2-4

[Interview with Ya.N. Shchapov, chairman of the Research Council on the Role of Religion in History and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, by *NAUKA I RELIGIYA* correspondent V. Lobachev: "Will the 'Blank Spots' Disappear?"]

[Text] Not too long ago a Research Council on the Role of Religion in History began to function within the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Our correspondent V. Lobachev met with the council's chairman, Academy of Sciences corresponding member Ya. N. Shchapov.

[Correspondent] Yaroslav Nikolayevich! What was the reason for creating the council?

[Shchapov] Gaping holes, "blank spots" in the conceptions of our scholars and therefore in the consciousness of Soviet people as well. We had not been taking into account a very important factor in history—the role of religion, the church. This is how the situation came about. Historians studied concrete historical phenomena. Say, the Mongol-Tatar yoke, or the age of Ivan the Terrible, or the Time of Troubles. And in this connection they also examined the role of church figures—Metropolitan Aleksiy or Metropolitan Filipp (Fedor Kolychev), Patriarch Germogen.... But this was strictly concrete analysis, without any generalizations whatsoever. They couldn't pose the broader question about the role of religion and the church—they simply weren't allowed. I myself, for example, defended my candidate dissertation on the role of the church in Ancient Rus'. And it took a long time for my section leader, Academician L. V. Cherepnin, to get this topic approved by the institute administration.... Everyone involved in this type of problem has experienced something similar. Meanwhile there were philosophers interested in questions of religion: they examined religion without reference to the era or concrete circumstances of its existence. And they examined it, unquestionably, as a negative phenomenon.

This kind of situation in scholarship, this one-sidedness, contributed to society's unobjective, distorted historical consciousness as well. In the final analysis, it led to well-known losses for culture—to the destruction of churches, icons, church books; to spiritual anomalies.

Today research is already being conducted differently: historians are posing broader questions related to the religious factor, and philosophers are paying more attention to the historical context, they are more interested in concrete religious tendencies, in individual church figures. It is now possible for historians and philosophers to work together in erasing the "blank spots." But the Academic Council's plans also include joint work with other humanists as well—literary and art scholars, sociologists and psychologists....

[Correspondent] The Council is called "The Role of Religions in History," that is, it brings together researchers studying various denominations, various national cultures, epochs. Has this lent a new quality to its work?

[Shchapov] On the level of information exchange—yes. But that's the least of it. We want to create a section of the Council called "The Methodology of the History of Religion," which would deal with working out principles

for collaboration among various types of specialists. It is my conviction, moreover, that a philosopher-religious scholar rather than a historian should head up the section. But here a departmental difficulty arises: our Academic Council is attached to the History Department, that is, to specialists who have gone through other departments of the Academy of Sciences. We cannot call on them actively, we cannot order them, we can only ask them. But the Council is surviving on a very strict diet, is functioning on societal principles, and our requests often find no response—which is not surprising if you consider that we are posing the most difficult questions.

The Council has managed to do something toward stimulating historical-religious research in places. In Georgia an academic council on the order of ours is being created. In many Siberian VUZes new research topics have been proposed dealing with the history of Christianity, in Kalmykiya with Buddhism, and in Karelia there is research going on into popular beliefs....

[Correspondent] How would you, Yaroslav Nikolayevich, define the role per se of religion in history? What is it? How is it expressed?

[Shchapov] I'll name just a few aspects—very important ones, I think. First is religion as a system of culture. How, for example, did this factor manifest itself in the history of Rus'? The Eastern Slavs were not direct legatees of the territory of the Roman Empire, unlike the Italians, French, part of the Germans, the Balkan peoples. They acquired this legacy of antiquity only through law, ideology, and culture, and the attainment of this came down primarily via Byzantine Orthodox tradition. Another very important aspect is religious ideology, its values. Attention to these has persisted even in our time. Other ideals have turned out either not to have as great an influence on minds or else to be not as inviolable.... A third point is the role of the administrative church system in the life of society. What did we always learn in school in talking about the governmental structure of Rus', of Russia? Apanage principalities, the great reign, tsarism.... We didn't examine the system of the patriarchy and the relations along that line with Constantinople, the system of bishoprics, local church unit—and after all, the role of these structures in the state was significant. Somehow the church courts were forgotten. Although it was they, and not the secular courts, that dealt with marriage and divorce, with relations between children and parents. In general, without the church, the priest, religion, man could not deal with such life events as birth, engagement, marriage, the appearance of heirs, and finally, death. In this scheme the history of the church is the history of citizens, of people. And not only in the Middle Ages. With respect to divorces, the church retained judicial power even in the 19th century.... We have studied these aspects too little and demonstrated them even less. Now the Council is determined to facilitate the appearance of this kind of topic in research plans.

[Correspondent] We studied it too little, but we knew the conclusion: the role of religion in history was negative....

[Shchapov] That, of course, is wrong. That is not a scientific concept but a political one directed at destroying religion. People had the idea that in the prerevolutionary era religion as an ideology served the politics of the ruling classes exclusively, that it was reactionary. And if that's so, then the revolution, the destruction of the remains of the feudal system and of capitalism, led to there being no need for religion, no place for it. There's no social base. Nor is there a gnosiological one—also because the natural sciences have enjoyed greater development, influence. But obviously that was an incorrect conception. Yes, of course, before the revolution there was dissatisfaction with the close tie between church and state. The individual was trampled under spiritual and administrative control, inasmuch as the church executed separate governmental functions. And the struggle went on. Both for the liberation of the individual from the "drug of religion," as they liked to say, but also for the liberation of the believer from state force. People were striving for spiritual freedom, and that contributed to the success of the revolutionary movements, it played a role both in February and in October of 1917. Later on it turned out that religious, church force had been transformed into its opposite, into antireligious force. In the end, this is where the warping in our historical consciousness comes in.

[Correspondent] And the "blank spots" not only in our understanding of past history but also in the topics that sound so real today: Patriarch Tikhon, the Uniate church?

[Shchapov] Naturally, questions involving the Uniate church were also examined primarily in a political rather than a scholarly or historical way. Although it is obvious that in various ages the Uniate church possessed a different historical content. Even over the course of the 20th century: what went on in the 1940s wasn't the same as in the 1970s and 1980s....

And the problems of Russian Orthodoxy at the turn of the 20th century! This is a very real book, but one we haven't read. Why did the church react negatively to revolutionary movements? How and why did the church leadership lose a certain degree of authority among believers? That is what happened after all! And what about the disagreement that arose between public opinion and the church? By studying how and why this in fact came about, we can picture more clearly the postrevolutionary period. Everything connected with the history of Orthodoxy during the Soviet era, in my view, is no less interesting than the conflicts in the upper levels of the party, about which so much is being written now. Sometimes it simply seems that Stalin is now more "popular" than during the years of his cult—in many magazines each issue has articles, reminiscences, photographs of him....

[Correspondent] Yaroslav Nikolayevich! You've brought up the topic of the church as an organization, an institution, on one hand, and the believer, his convictions and ideas, on the other. But after all, can't we say that the popular understanding of Christianity always differed somewhat from the official, theological understanding? Sometimes we are given a definition, which science has yet to explain fully, of "popular Orthodoxy." The intelligentsia of the 19th and 20th centuries also had their "own" Christianity. Do such gradations of religious consciousness find an echo in the Council's thematic deliberations?

[Shchapov] The theme of popular as well as individual religious consciousness is very interesting. We do not have to evaluate the historical situation only with respect to the state's official creed or on the level of ideas of a religious community. The individual has thoughts that do not coincide with those generally accepted. And when any religious prohibitions fall (as they did, for example, both in Peter's time and in the 19th century, censorship was strong, and then after 1905 attitudes toward the Old Believers and other confessions the attitude softened), then the individual understanding of religion manifests itself more sharply. This is happening, I think, in our era as well. There's something to study! Moreover, in the scheme of the evolution, the use of old traditions in modern denominations....

But this work requires proper conditions, it requires a new level of organization for research, a new attitude toward it. For the time being we are using a made-to-order, consumer approach: one or another anniversary approaches, a date—and works are prepared and published. If at this time you should want to publish a work connected in principle with the same trend (with the history of religion, in our case), but not on the exact topic—they won't understand you. If a conference is organized, then the ones that respond directly to its title are the ones that are published. And so forth. But in order to conduct broader and subtler research, in order to raise somehow less winning issues, you need special centers.... I'm not saying an Institute of the History of Religion, of Religious Scholarship, although it is clearly needed, but at least some structural units in institutes, study groups. As of now we do not have that either in our Institute of USSR History or in our Institute of World History. We only have it among Orientalists and in the Institute of Ethnography....

[Correspondent] Yaroslav Nikolayevich! In the recommendations prepared by your Council, at a certain point questions dealing with Old Believers are separated out. How do you explain this special attention?

[Shchapov] There are several reasons for this. First and foremost, it is important to study Old Believers as a popular movement, especially for the understanding of the historical processes of the 17th and 18th centuries. In later times the role of Old Believers in preserving the ancient Russian heritage, monuments of writing and art, was great. There is in addition the international aspect;

after all, Russian Old Believers are now found in many countries and are studied there. A few years ago I had the opportunity to participate in the work of an international conference on Old Believers—in Heidelberg. Historians and philosophers, art scholars and linguists gathered there. That kind of comradeship-in-arms is still only in our future....

[Correspondent] The Council's plans provide for cooperation with religious organizations as well. How is that envisioned?

[Shchapov] We are very poorly educated with respect to the content of belief. We historians often do not have a true understanding of the religious person, his ideas, what he accepts as canon. Western religious scholars, including those who do not believe in religion, study, have the chance to study in corresponding university seminars. For example, there are extremely interesting programs at the Sorbonne in the Department of Religion and at Temple University (USA). For us the source of such focused, practical religious scholarship is the church, its religious schools. Postgraduate study there by historian specialists would be very useful. And I hope that this will happen, although at times our requests are met cautiously.

It should be said, however, that in the academic institutes there are specialists who have made thorough studies of the history of Christianity, religious teachings, and they, we are now realizing, are the people from whom the students of our religious academies will learn.

We had contact with theologians at the conferences held by the Moscow Patriarchate in connection with the millenium of Rus's christening and with the 400-year anniversary of the establishment of the patriarchate in the Russian Orthodox church. For the time being our Council is less active in arranging conferences than the church is—due to limited organizational capabilities. However we invite theologians and church historians to join in the Council's academic undertakings. Joint publications with the Moscow Patriarchate are a possibility with the participation of the Fund for Slavic Writing and Culture. We might, say, issue the works of the remarkable 16th-century thinker Maksim Grek.

[Correspondent] Yaroslav Hikolayevich! Does the reader have any hope that with the help of the Council a new history of the Russian church will appear in a while?

[Shchapov] We have thought about this. However, the collections that came out in 1988-89 from the Mysl, Nauka, and Politizdat publishing houses dedicated to the acceptance of Christianity and the early ages in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church pretty well summed up the scholarly research in that area done in anticipation of the anniversary. We would achieve nothing essentially new if in the wake of this we were to put out—at the same level of knowledge—a one- or two-volume history of the church.

Right now we need to write monographs on distinct problems in church history, on distinct periods. These will create a base for a new historical code. We would like to prepare for not only a history of the church as an organization, a system, but a history of Orthodoxy, of Christianity, in Russia.

When religiosity so permeated society, as in the last century, then it was sufficient to write just such a history of the church (the 19th century has given us some very interesting examples of this: for example, the work of Ye. Ye. Golubinskiy, a phenomenon as yet not recognized in research, an author who did not fall inside the church-historical framework of his time...). But now, one hundred years later, we have to come to a new awareness of what religiosity is, what Orthodoxy is, we have to conceptualize the role and place of Christianity in the history of Russia. The new history must include both the history of the perception of divinity, of the Trinity, and the history not only of the mass but, if I can put it this way, the scholarly religious consciousness. The collections of recent years deal with this least of all—in the sections written by historians. The philosophers have it. But without the historical approach these elaborations make no sense, for they must rely on the study of historical sources, and it is this historical research that provides the means for extracting from sources new reliable information. It also requires the participation of philologists studying the texts from the standpoint of the history of language.

All this affects not only Orthodoxy. We need collective works as well on the history of other denominations existing in our country—the history of Catholicism, of Protestantism on the territory of the USSR, the history of Islam in our country, and so forth.

We are sensible to our tasks in this matter, we feel both the necessity and the responsibility. Unfortunately, conditions for this have not been the best so far. We are not getting much help. But I've already spoken of this....

COPYRIGHT: Zhurnal "Nauka i religiya," 1990.

Informal Orthodox Journal Published

90UN1278A Moscow *VECHERNAYA MOSKVA*
in Russian 12 Mar 90 p 1

[Unattributed article: "Religious Chronicle"]

[Text] The first issue of the informal orthodox journal PCHELA, which is published by the Saint Ioanna (Maksimovicha) Fund, has just been received by subscribers. This fund was organized at the end of 1989. The purpose of the journal is to acquaint readers living in Russia with one of the extraordinary saints of the twentieth century, as well as with the works of the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad, to propagate pure canonical Orthodoxy, and to combat Ecumenism and Modernism... Well, apparently, pluralism in religion is also unavoidable.

Orthodox Synod Deplores Loss of Cathedral

90UN1732A Kiev *PRAVDA UKRAINY* in Russian
13 Apr 90 p 3

[Report by Filaret, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia, Patriarchal Exarch of all the Ukraine: "Declaration of the Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Connection with the Unlawful Decision of the Lvov City Soviet of People's Deputies on the Transfer of the Cathedral of Saint Yura to the Eastern-Rite Catholics"]

[Text] The Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church received the tidings of the 6 April 1990 decision of the Lvov City Soviet of People's Deputies to transfer the Orthodox cathedral of Saint Yura and the eparchal residence to the Eastern-Rite Catholics.

We consider this act to be a gross violation of the rights of the faithful of the Orthodox Church, a flouting of Soviet laws and international accords. To our great sorrow, the "fathers" of the city of Lvov decided to meet the demands of the Eastern-Rite Catholics at the expense of the rights of the Orthodox. Can this be just? They are taking the cathedral away from the Orthodox and transferring it to the Catholics! They condemn Stalinist methods, while they themselves are not acting in the best manner. They are leading some out from the underground, and are driving others into it. Where are the Ukrainian Orthodox going to pray on the paschal days? After all, the deputies have taken from them, the believers of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the city of Lvov, their last cathedral, and have not offered any other cathedral. Is this not a mockery of democracy?

The Orthodox community of the Cathedral of Saint Yura has not violated the conditions of the agreement reached with the state. And the agreement did not disintegrate on its own. For only upon these two conditions may the agreement for the use of the cathedral and its property be dissolved. The Lvov people's deputies have disregarded the effective legislation. How, after this, do they intend to participate in the construction of a rule-of-law state, while violating its existing laws? It is appropriate here to cite the words of the Holy Scriptures, "Physician, heal thyself."

We feel that neither the Episcopate of Eastern-Rite Catholics, nor even the city soviet, are authorized to repudiate the decision of the quadrilateral commission created by the Synod of Bishops of the Moscow Patriarchate and Pope John Paul II. It is charged with resolving by peaceful means the issues of distributing cathedrals among the Orthodox and Eastern-Rite Catholics.

The deputies of the Lvov city soviet take upon themselves the entire responsibility for inflaming religious enmity, for dividing our people and families, for national discord, for offending religious sensitivities, for trampling upon holy ground, and for tearing at the Ukrainian soul.

We appeal to the people's deputies of the Western Ukraine: Do not pour oil on the fire, for the human suffering toward which these illegal acts lead will be on your conscience. Be human beings and do not lay on the Orthodox people of Galicia a burden of suffering greater than they can bear. Have fear of God! He is long-suffering, but in His power lies the fate of every people and every man. Do not forget that the Lord is the righteous Judge, and in his time will mete out to everyone according to his works, as it was in history.

In this volatile situation, in the name of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, we appeal to all Ukrainian SSR people's deputies, the government of the Ukrainian SSR, to the public, to the Orthodox and Catholics, to all the faithful and non-believers to recognize the full tragedy of the situation which has come about in Lvov and the Western Ukraine during the paschal days, as well as its possible grievous consequences for the Ukrainian people and our entire fatherland. We feel that legality, rather than force, can stop the collision and create the preconditions for healing deep religious wounds. We appeal for common sense, for the cessation of force and discrimination, for the restoration of justice and legality, for ensuring freedom of conscience not in word but in deed for both Catholics and the Orthodox. We appeal to the entire multi-millioned Orthodox flock to intensify their zealous prayers to our Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered for us on the cross and rose from the dead in order that He give us His peace and love and deliver us from any evil.

In the name of the Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church

Filaret, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia, Patriarchal Exarch of all the Ukraine

Head of the Lithuanian Orthodox Church Interviewed

90UN1243A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
6 Mar 90 p 1

[Interview with Archbishop Khrizostom, head of the Orthodox Church in Lithuania, ruling bishop of the Vilnius and Lithuanian diocese, by G. Shlevis: "To Light One's Light..."; date and place not specified]

[Text] The ruling bishop of the Vilnius and Lithuanian diocese, Archbishop Khrizostom (in the world Yegor Fedorovich Martishkin) was appointed head of the Orthodox Church in Lithuania. He was born in 1934 in Ryazan Oblast in a peasant family. Yegor was 12 years old when the death of his father forced him to drop school and go to work in a kolkhoz. Then he worked in a brigade of restorers, was an ornamentist and gilder.

Brought up in the Orthodox faith, the youth entered the Moscow Ecclesiastical Seminary, then—the Academy. He served in the parishes of Moscow, worked in the Department of Foreign Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchy, and for 10 years occupied the post of deputy

chairman of this department. From 1974 Khrizostom was the ruling bishop of the Kursk diocese, from 1984, before he came to Vilnius, he headed the Irkutsk and Chita diocese.

We are publishing an interview with the head of the Orthodox Church in Lithuania, Archbishop Khrizostom.

[Shelvis] Your Eminence, before You, the Orthodox Church in Lithuania was headed by Bishop Antoni. You have the rank of archbishop, but, let us say, the Riga and the Latvian diocese is headed by Metropolitan Leonid. Is there a fundamental significance for a diocese in the rank of its head?

[Archbishop Khrizostom] In principle, no. In our country we have three metropolitan cathedrals: The Kiev and Galicia, the Krutinka and Kolomna (Moscow Oblast), and the Leningrad and Novgorod cathedrals. According to the teaching about the church, there are three levels in the priesthood: The diaconate, the priesthood, and the episcopate. Everything else is from the devil.

Remember, the Apostles—the disciples of Christ—did not have any ranks. They were simply Peter, John, James.... They were modest people, of course, they were not administrators as some priests today. Yes, bishops worked in every place. But the episcopates were autonomous, and all the champions of the will of God are equal among themselves. It is already in time that the episcopates began to unite into alliances and, naturally, there appeared an administrative hierarchy. We must recognize that the church, above all, is the mythical body of Christ, it does not have any boundaries, neither Lithuanian, nor Latvian, nor any others. We frequently forget about this, we strive for some sort of bureaucratic life.

Incidentally, about Bishop Antoni, my predecessor... In the summer of last year he submitted an official paper to the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, in which he proposed to have here, in Lithuania, an archbishop in order to raise the authority of the Orthodox Church. Indeed, in Lithuania, as you know, there are seven Catholic bishops together with the Monsignor Cardinal Vintcentas Sladkyavichus.... They accommodated Bishop Antoni. The Holy Synod sent an Orthodox archbishop to Lithuania.

I held the rank of archbishop for 18 years, since 1977 I have been archbishop, and, evidently, they considered it necessary to send a more or less experienced archbishop here. And my personal attitude to the church hierarchy I have already indicated above.

[Shelvis] Your Eminence, your entire previous life is connected with the central zone of Russia, Siberia; now you have come to a specific region, the Baltic, where the majority of believing population are Catholics. Did you have preliminary information about Lithuania, with what feeling did not accept your new appointment?

[Archbishop Khrizostom] I have always regard the Baltic as a whole, and Lithuania in particular, with a special feeling. Here the general level of culture is sufficiently high. And we, uncomplicated Russians (to whose group I count myself as belonging), must recognize this. The fact that I found myself in Catholic Lithuania in general impressed me, because the 20th century is a century of ecumenism (that is coexistence).

Speaking of ecumenism, we, above all, have in mind the points of contact of Orthodoxy and Catholicism. Because these religions are the closest. It is with the Catholics, you see, that we have had seven ecumenical councils. We have lived together for 1,000 years—West and East. We cannot but take this into account. Our church traditions and dogmatic doctrine are very close. I recognize with pleasure that in Lithuania there are not only Orthodox, but also Catholics. And, therefore, the most realistic ecumenical is, above all, the relations of Orthodox and Catholics.

Of course, I do not conceal my confusion—at 55 years of age it is rather difficult to change surroundings. But the Lord has always led me in His Providential ways, and I am internally ready for this meeting. Why? The last 5 years in Irkutsk were beneficial for me. I reflected on my situation, I read a great deal, and I was able to expand my horizon. I believe that I will be able to usefully apply my life experience and my knowledge in Lithuania. And to carry out ecumenical activity—to organize contacts with our brothers and sisters belonging to the Catholic Church.

There are, of course, difficulties, in particular, the lack of knowledge of the Lithuanian language. But, I think, they will somehow be overcome.

[Shelvis] Your Eminence, in Lithuania there are 41 Orthodox parishes. In Vilnius alone, there are eight Orthodox churches, there is a monastery for men and one for women. In a way, not a bad base for the satisfaction of the needs of the believers, isn't that so?

[Archbishop Khrizostom] The temples by themselves—this is not yet everything. They may have their spiritual values, and they may be remarkable monuments of architecture. The churches, which I have already had the occasion to see, are precisely such. But, indeed, the main thing, is the people, a temple without man loses its significance. The spiritual value only then is such when it is addressed directly to man. Then man sees it, is edified and inspired by it.

Here, let us say, the Temple of the Holy Spirit in Vilnius. I had to see here also extremely miserable, sick, and suffering people. They show themselves in different ways. And it is sad that very few who came to the temple take part in the worship service. But, indeed, the temple is remarkable, and there are those who lead a monastic life, and there is a fine service. And marvelous choirs—both high clergy and monastic, men's and women's. But the proper attention to the service on the part of the majority of those present is lacking. And, unfortunately,

there are few prayer-books. So that, you see... We are losing the taste for the noble. You see, prayer is the heart of spiritual life.

Yes, in Lithuania there are 41 parishes and at the same time only 28 priests, not considering those who are in the monastery. How to bring up children in the Orthodox faith without clergymen. There are enough problems, as you see.

[Shelvis] Your Eminence, when you received your ordination, you received the name of Khrizostom. In the translation from the Greek, it means eloquent orator [chrysostom]. Is personal desire of any significance in the name-designation?

[Archbishop Khrizostom] In this case, they gave me the name which I wanted. In 1966 I was in a group of pilgrims and visited the sacred places of the East. I was in Greece, in Athos. In Athens, I met with the head of the Greek Orthodox Church Khrizostom [Chrysostom]. This attractive elder made an enormous impression on me. From him emanated enormous inner strength. And it was the first time that I had heard this name, it was pleasant and it caressed the ear. And when my spiritual father—Nikodim, the former metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod—began to talk of my monastic life, I expressed my opinion about the name. With the blessing of Nikodim, I became Khrizostom.

[Shelvis] Your Eminence, at the end of January I was in the Moscow Dom Kino [House of Cinema] for an evening called "Belaya Staya" [White Flight]. The Countess Tatyana Tolstaya, the writer, the granddaughter of Aleksey Tolstoi, the princes Golitsyn and Trubetskoy, and the representatives of other well-known Russian families appeared. Priests also spoke at the evening. The discussion, in principle, came to the conclusion that the Civil War was the greatest tragedy of Russia, that in it there were no victors, but only losers. They talked about how to lift the country today out of its crisis. Among other opinions, one was stood out, expressed by an ecclesiastic, that only in religion is there a path to general salvation. Do you share this point of view?

[Archbishop Khrizostom] Christianity preaches a very high morality. It can be an important element in the life of the ordinary person and society as a whole. But only if in society there is a sufficiently high level of spirituality and morality.

But what is happening in our country today? Orthodoxy has a very rich arsenal of remarkable works and philosophers, and the church fathers. But the point is that it is concealed from our fellow-citizens. Let us imagine that all of these riches will be opened up for the people. I am afraid that for many reasons, and above all because of the defects in education, these sources will simply be unintelligible for the majority of people. People will not be able to see the values in these works.

The overwhelming majority of our citizens orient themselves on literature that is not serious. It seems to me, simply vulgar literature. If people more often would turn to the highly spiritual secular classical literature, let us say to Dostoevski, Turgenev, and Gogol, they would not become degraded to such an extent as today. You see, the whole system of education, for example, in the school, has proceeded and proceeds up to now in an administrative manner. Indeed, not without reason does Academician D.S. Likhachev tirelessly repeat that the level of education of the youth needs to be raised, giving it access to high art and to real literature.

For this reason, I personally do not believe that only the Russian Orthodox Church will transform society. To whom does the Orthodox Church appeal? You see, it is voice crying in the wilderness!

Apparently, it is necessary for society to reach an extreme point, and then either to perish or to begin to rise to eminence. Whether there will be a resurrection is for the time being still very unclear. Listen, all are saying that everything in our country is bad, that we need "to increase, to intensify", etc. But, you see, this is only glib propaganda. No one wants to work. Because work is inconspicuous, laborious, and by no means noisy. But to shout on corners—for this a great mind is not necessary. The main thing is not only that we have thousands, but that many have no desire to light even a single light.

And in this undertaking, everyone has his possibilities—the church parishes have some, the dioceses—others, the intelligentsia and the workers—still others. But all of us can have common platforms, common concrete measures.

One scholar noted that in the beginning religion opposed science, then science opposed religion. But now the time has come when science and religion must face each other. Only all together, united—politicians, public figures, believers and non-believers, and priests—can we transform the world. Only, according to the expression of my spiritual father Nikodim, "everyone has to find his cell," the point of exerting effort.

Minsk Believers, Cinematographers Vie for Building

90UN1151A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian No 10, 10 Mar 90 p 2

[Unattributed article: "Who Is Closer to God?"]

[Text] The Minsk Gorispolkom has placed a Roman-Catholic church and the Union of Cinematographers together in one building.

There was a time when the gorispolkom, generally speaking, wanted to blow up this church so as not to confuse its own atheistic "chastity," since the windows of these authorities looked directly out onto the institution pleasing to God. Because of the improbable efforts of the city's intelligentsia, this landmark of olden times

managed to remain. And now it seems that the city authorities are more prepared to tolerate the existing church than the existing Union of Cinematographers, which has pretty well spoiled some nerves by its democratic and public activities. Operating actively under the roof of the Cinematographers' House is the campaign center of the republic's creative unions and the Belorussian People's Front. But here the true owners of the church manifested themselves. Recently its walls have been approached more and more frequently by believers bearing posters and lighted candles, singing psalms and demanding that their cathedral be given back to them.

In general, the demands were justified. And without taking too long to think about the matter, the gorispolkom promised the following: we will return your cathedral; the only thing that must be done is to resettle the cinematographers. It is they who are to blame, they said, for the cathedral not being returned to you. But the Christians, although they are patient people, did not entirely disband at this point. They began to occupy the cathedral by force, and the gorispolkom did not, in fact, react to this. It's a good thing that these believers proved to be intelligent, well-educated people. They agreed to negotiations with the cinematographers.

"We respect your feelings, and we are prepared to return the church," the present-day owners said to the real owners. "But please understand us too. We have no place to go to."

The city fathers have blocked all demands and requests to grant another building to the Union of Cinematographers. There are letters, suggestions, and requests sent by the Belorussian Union of Cinematographers at all levels—it is easy to check that out. It's as if the gorispolkom decided to act as a third judge in this dispute. But without having consulted with either party, it sent a letter to the republic's Council of Ministers containing the following proposal...to temporarily combine the cathedral and the Cinematographers' House in this one building.

There is one more detail in this story. In his election program, V. Mikhasev, the gorispolkom chairman, placed particular emphasis upon the fact that he would fight for churches to be returned to believers. Can it really be done this way?

Uniate, Orthodox Conflict in Ivano-Frankovsk Described

90UN1150A Kiev MOLOD UKRAYINY in Ukrainian
11 Feb 90 p 2

[Article by MOLOD UKRAYINY special correspondent Viktor Kosarchuk: "In an Area of Particular Tension"]

[Text] Ivano-Frankovsk is a peaceful town. Occasionally the tranquility is disrupted by pickets, the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth, or dismissal of the party oblast committee first secretary—forgive me, I mean

retirement due to pressure from below, for at the present time we have neither a mechanism of dismissal nor a precedent for dismissal.

Anybody can walk into the party oblast committee offices—with the policeman's permission. For us it is outright "nizzya" [refers to Russian word "nel'zya"—"you can't go in"]. The sergeant stationed by the entrance to the oblast executive committee has a higher level of pluralism, and there is no outright denial of entry. I don't know, however, if the rank-and-file kolkhoz farmer would be allowed on the premises.

The Komsomol oblast committee is a couple of floors higher, and there is greater democracy there. There is a Bible on Sector Chief Ihor Fedyshyn's desk. Apparently its owner reads it, takes notes, and ruminates. The situation demands it.

...The Goshevo Monastery did not welcome us at all on the last day of January. Our UAZ had been lurching down a long downhill stretch, driveshaft grinding. The abbot, Father Serafim, politely showed us the door. We had no recourse but to drive to Dolina. The Greek Catholics had recently lifted their "siege" of the rayon committee in this town. Now passions have been boiling in another part of the town of Staraya Dolina. We were stopped, given a close looking over, and our press credentials were closely examined. A Greek Catholic choir was singing by the Russian Orthodox church. They were demanding that the church be turned over to them. The rayon executive committee was meeting, deliberating and failing to bring clarity to the situation.

On 1 February the town was rife with rumor: "The Greek Catholics held Didokha, deputy chairman of the rayon executive committee, until midnight." We saw crowds of people gathering and proceeding in the direction of the party rayon committee. In the meantime at Goshevo the monastery was continuing its workaday life. Father Zinovi was clicking his abacus, calculating debits and credits, while novices Mykhaylo and Kostyantyn were reading the secular periodicals OGONEK and VSE-VIT. We learned from them that the abbot, Father Serafim, had recently been threatened. Then some monks joined in the conversation, and we heard an interesting thing. They were willing to give up the monastery, for it had been Greek Catholic. But monks had recently been "transferred" here from Pochayev. On the other hand, the church authorities were remaining silent and even counseling them to stand to the last monk. It seems that the local authorities are watching and waiting. It may be that they are too busy with the marathon election campaign, or else they have not received any specific instructions.

Toward evening the Goshevo Monastery was "stormed" by a throng of Greek Catholics. An unofficial camera recorded the carried yellow-and-blue symbols and the agitated people. There were also talks held between the monastery's abbot, Father Serafim, and Bishop Vasylyk.

Later the abbot stated: "I consider seizure of the monastery unlawful." The crowd proceeded to disperse, and night fell over the monastery. But the monks were engaged in filling cupboards and refrigerators for the Dolina Children's Home. In addition they decided to donate 10,000 rubles for our orphans. But recently the children's home had placed an order for a Lenin tapestry for 14,000 rubles.

But let us return to our problems. That evening a group of Russian Orthodox faithful from the village of Klepcheye came to the monastery. Lamentation, tears, and complaints about Greek Catholic militance. I later heard numerous mutual insults, curses, and ultraleftist slogans.

In my opinion the Greek Catholics are more organized today. They have recently emerged from the underground and are now flexing their shoulders and wanting to take back the churches of their forebears. They are willing to accept a compromise, with church services to be both for Greek Catholics and for Russian Orthodox.

Some people by habit hang the label of "nationalism" on them. What I see here, however, is plain garden-variety, somewhat warmed-over "patriotism." The absence of intelligent, reasoned debate and democratic principles aggravates the situation. The solution lies in holding a referendum. The local authorities are being catastrophically slow about holding a referendum.

One apparatchik admitted: "Consequences of the past instructions to badger Rukh are in evidence. Today it is difficult for a Komsomol member or Communist to gain trust." The plan for combating Rukh has boomeranged. Right now ultraleftwingers are voicing slogans such as "Soviets without Communists." The flywheel of the election campaign is winding up against the background of a total, across-the-board shortage of manufactured goods and foodstuffs. I doubt if anybody would venture to predict election results....

Within the confines of this brief article I shall not touch upon even one percent of the problems which have been accumulating over the course of many years. I shall mention the main problems, however. On the last day of our field assignment, Russian Orthodox believers invested the offices of the rayon executive committee. A "mass meeting" was held in the office of deputy chairman V. M. Didokha. They were demanding a decision in their favor. Once again our credentials were examined. Through the noise and tears we heard an official reply: "A commission has been formed; we shall hold a referendum...." We wanted to meet with the deputy chairman of the rayon executive committee for a clarification of the situation. We were unable to find him, however. He disappeared to who knows where.

Here at the rayon executive committee I happened to encounter the leader of the Christian Democratic Front, Sichko. He declined to be interviewed. Later, it is true, he proceeded to try to convince me of the righteousness

of his cause. For my part, I appealed then and I appeal now for patience and the ability to hear out one's opponents.

A state governed by rule of law is not built in a day. One of the steps toward it is a Law on Freedom of Conscience. While not at all idealizing it, I am 100 percent for such a law, just as I am for the rights of Russian Orthodox believers, for recognition of a Ukrainian autocephalous church, and for returning churches to the Greek Catholics.

I also agree that a person should pray to God in his own native language. In the final analysis this is one of the aspects of rebirth of ethnic consciousness and pride in one's people. But all these problems and debates should be placed on the negotiating table, on the table of dialogue, for a state governed by rule of law can be built only by democratic methods.

Probably the readers expected me to come forth with ready recipes and a clear-cut line of policy. But I, just like you, am searching, thinking, and reevaluating a great many things. I recall something said by a hotel employee: "The head of our party rayon committee spoke in Russian, but people here don't understand Russian." I had no arguments in defense of the rayon committee secretary.

That is about it. Following good tradition, oblast Komsomol committee officials met with us just before our departure. They wanted to know our impressions, because, after all, we had been visiting an area of particular tension.

Orthodox Hierarchs on Religious Conflict in Ukraine

*90UN1169A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 15 Feb 90 p 4*

[Article by V. Desyatnikov: "Cooperation: From a Press Conference at the Exarchate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church"]

[Text] These comments deal with important events in the affairs of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. This is what it has called itself since the recent Russian Orthodox Church council of bishops [arkhiereys'kyy—a term covering bishops, archbishops, and metropolitans]. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church will henceforth possess considerable independence or, stated more precisely, autonomy. Within the Exarchate supreme legislative, executive, and judicial authority will reside in the synod. Many problems will now be resolved in a new way. For what purpose? The new status of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church is supposed to enable the faithful to handle church affairs independently, according to national and confessional traditions, and is to foster development of the church's spiritual potential.

The first synod has now met, followed by a press conference between the hierarchs of the church and

representatives of the press, radio, and television. "We have given thanks to God," Metropolitan Filaret, Exarch of the Ukraine, said in an introductory statement, "that we henceforth shall have a Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which will resolve vital issues independently. Such issues were included on the agenda of our first synod, which has just ended."

As we know, as a result of a formal agreement between the Moscow Patriarchate and the Roman Catholic Church, a combined quadripartite Orthodox-Catholic commission is being formed, commissioned to settle the interfaith conflict which has become aggravated in some oblasts in the Western Ukraine. The commission is to include representatives of the Vatican, the Moscow Patriarchate, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, and the Eastern-Rite Catholics [Uniates]. At its first synod the Ukrainian Orthodox Church designated its representatives to this commission. Commission members will include Archbishop of Lvov and Drohobych Iryney and Archpriest Oleksandr Shvets. The Moscow Patriarchate will be represented by Metropolitan of Voronezh Mefodiy. The Exarch of the Ukraine stated that in order to achieve normalization of relations between the Orthodox faithful and the Eastern-Rite Catholics, a commission should be formed, consisting of representatives of the Eastern-Rite Catholics, which could help achieve resolution of current problems. Metropolitan Filaret emphasized that the Roman Catholic Church and personally Pope John Paul II are appealing for peaceful resolution of the conflict.

Since the people in this republic are deeply troubled by the conflict between the Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches, which has already led to serious excesses and complications, most of the questions at the press conference pertained to this conflict.

This writer asked Metropolitan Filaret: "Your Eminence, how in your opinion will events develop? Is there hope that passions will cool in the near future? I would also like to hear the opinions of Archbishop Iryney and other hierarchs present here today on this matter."

Archbishop Iryney. "Unfortunately a conflict exists, a serious conflict. As you know, this matter was discussed at a recent meeting of representatives of the Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches. They noted that problems in interchurch relations in the Western Ukraine arise primarily not on religious soil. And that is so. Unfortunately political adventurers of various ilk, who are fairly numerous at the present time, particularly among the so-called unofficial ["informal"] organizations, are 'warming their hands' on our problems. I have been in Kiev for several days now, and during the entire time I have been hearing about new conflicts. They are being caused—and I stress this once again—by persons who essentially have nothing to do with our affairs and who are artificially 'adding fuel to the fire' of these conflicts, even where problems are already being resolved. In a number of cases the authorities are powerless.

"Here is a fact for you. Just before I left for Kiev I was visited by a delegation of Orthodox faithful from a village in Lvov Oblast—120 persons. These people complained that they had been literally attacked by representatives of Eastern-Rite Catholics, who had smashed and broken up everything in the holy church. They submitted a formal complaint to me, as well as to the oblast executive committee. And what did the authorities do? Nothing. This is presently a serious obstacle in the path of resolving the conflict—inaction by the authorities and toleration of unlawful actions.

"In addition, the following trend has been noted. By decision of representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church, recommendations have been drawn up pertaining to normalization of relations between religious believers. But since the above-mentioned commission is not yet operating, there are those who are hastening to take advantage of the moment. There is occurring a new wave of seizures of Orthodox churches, acts of lawlessness, and intimidation.

"In one community Greek Catholics seized a church on the direct counsel of members of Rukh—this incident was cited at this press conference."

Author's comment: About intimidation and psychological (and not only psychological) terror tactics.

I have had the occasion to talk with a great many churchmen and religious believers—Orthodox believers from the western oblasts of the Ukraine. They cited dozens of examples of actions by the activists of the Committee to Defend the Greek Catholic Church and a number of other unofficial organizations. They are doing a real job of intimidation.

Here is how they determined in one of the villages in Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast who was for the Greek Catholic Church and who was for the Orthodox Church. There was complete democracy and a "secret" ballot. They placed ballots into two ballot boxes. They placed a little red flag—a "moskal's'ky" [insulting word for Russian] flag—next to the ballot box favoring the Orthodox Church, and a yellow-and-blue flag by the other ballot box. And there were husky lads standing by, carefully watching to see who placed his ballot into which box.

When intimidation does not work, they have begun resorting to outright terror tactics. The following fact was cited at the press conference. A total of eight houses of rank-and-file believers have recently been burned down just in Dolinskiy Rayon, Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast—the victims were persons who had failed to heed the "advice" of certain gentlemen to convert to Greek Catholicism and had remained faithful to the Russian Orthodox Church. What will the future bring?

Among arguments in justification of intimidation and violations of the law, I have repeatedly heard statements to the effect that the Greek Catholics are the wronged party to the conflict, that they have suffered over the

course of many years, and now.... Yes, it is true that many Eastern-Rite Catholics suffered misfortune during the reign of Stalin. And in my opinion society must take this fact into account. But Metropolitan Filaret touched upon this question at the press conference from a somewhat unexpected aspect. Is there any benefit in us now weighing who suffered most? As he sees it, the Russian Orthodox Church has experienced even greater losses, and its wounds have not yet healed to this day. So should salt be rubbed into these wounds? The fact is that a thesis advanced by some current "political affairs writers," to the effect that the authorities have always gone easy on the Russian Orthodox Church because it is one of the institutions the authorities need, fails to stand up to serious examination.

Here are a few other facts on this problem, which were cited at the press conference. On 31 January a decision was made in a certain community in Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast to lock and seal a church, since passions were raging over this church. This failed to calm people down. A fight broke out between Russian Orthodox faithful and Greek Catholics. They literally went for each other's throats.

Question: How many Eastern-Rite Catholic faithful are there presently in the western oblasts of the Ukraine? Sometimes one hears a figure of 4-5 million persons. How credible is this figure?

Reply by Metropolitan Filaret: "This figure is unquestionably wrong, although nobody knows what the exact figures are. One can proceed from the following calculation. It has been determined that approximately 75 percent of the population in the western oblasts of the Ukraine are religious believers. And one out of five religious believers is a Greek Catholic. The remainder are either Russian Orthodox or belong to other denominations: Baptist or Seventh-Day Adventist."

Question: Do you not feel that in connection with legalization of the Greek Catholic Church it is advisable and important to revise the decision of the 1946 Council of Lvov?

Metropolitan Filaret: "The problem here is broader and more complex than you have stated it. A thorough analysis of the 1946 situation is impossible without analysis of the substance of the 1596 Union of Brest and of subsequent events. Incidentally, today some people do not remember that two councils were held back then, almost 400 years ago, and each of them played a historic role. Sometimes you even encounter total ignorance about the 1946 Council of Lvov. Even today some people are not aware of the fact that this was a council of Greek Catholics. There were only a few invited Russian Orthodox in attendance. Yes, we know in what period that council was held. Yes, we know that Stalinist officials grossly and criminally interfered in church affairs. Serious mistakes were made both on the part of the Greek Catholics and on the part of the Russian Orthodox. But in order to understand these matters it is

necessary to analyze documents, facts, and historical testimony as an aggregate, rather than engaging in political opportunism."

Author's comment: It would seem that Rukh and the Helsinki Alliance as political organizations committed a serious error in wholeheartedly taking the side of the Eastern-Rite Catholics in this conflict. If this was an impulsive, emotional desire to take the side of the injured party, then one can understand it. But only as an initial impulse. But what about after that? One should proceed from the conflict itself. Consideration of the positions of the parties involved, as well as dialogue and mutual concessions are essential here. The Russian Orthodox Church, the Vatican, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, and the Greek Catholics will be speaking. Rukh, which at the present time unfortunately frequently "becomes involved" in conflicts, will hardly be able to take part in peace negotiations, since it is patently prejudiced and has no contact with the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. And yet the latter has millions of religious-believer Ukrainian adherents.

Other interesting matters pertaining to church affairs were also examined at the press conference. One issue involves the language in which the Ukrainian Orthodox Church communicates with its parishioners. At the present time church services are conducted in two languages—Church Slavonic and Ukrainian. For the most part in Church Slavonic. But the position of the Exarchate is that as the number of parishes which wish to change over to the Ukrainian language increases, these wishes will unquestionably be met.

There are two seminaries in the Ukraine—one in Odessa and one in Kiev. Ukrainian language and literature are being taught at both. There is a need to establish another seminary, at which all classes will be taught in Ukrainian.

Author's comment: We have presented in this article primarily the position of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church on a number of issues, in particular the conflict with Eastern-Rite Catholics. This conflict can be analyzed from various points of view, and various approaches can be taken to these points of view. Although in our opinion any and all manifestations of coercion merit unconditional condemnation. But there is a law which states that in any conflict one cannot limit oneself to explaining the point of view of only one side, no matter how clear the situation might seem. Positions can be further clarified and detailed. The various positions must be presented in detail and submitted to discussion. Could spokesmen for the Eastern-Rite Catholics also gather together representatives of the mass media and discuss the matter in an honest, open and straightforward manner?

End of Industrial Development Demanded at Shevchenko Memorial in Kanev

90UN1369A Kiev *LITERATURNIA UKRAYINA*
in Ukrainian No 10, 8 Mar 90 p 7

["Open letter to Comrade V.A. Masol, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers", by the Ukrainian Culture Foundation, Ukrainian Society for the Preservation of Historic and Cultural Monuments and Kanev State Order of Friendship of Peoples T.G. Shevchenko Museum-Memorial]

[Text] Dear Vitaliy Andreyevich!

Passions have already been flowing for two years around industrial development in the protected landscape zone of the Shevchenko Memorial in the town of Kanev. There has been more than enough time to solve the problem for the benefit of the world-renowned national Memorial. It would seem that three decisions of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers regarding Kanev - the first one, of November 21, 1989, "On Creating the Shevchenko National Memorial in the Town of Kanev", the second one, of January 18, 1990, "On Creating the State Landscape Memorial 'Taras Horizon'", and the third one, of January 26, 1990, "On Measures Aimed at Developing the Sociocultural Sphere of the Town of Kanev and the Kanev Rayon in 1990-2000" - would finally solve the problem of preservation of the national holy place. Indeed, paragraph 5 of the third decision reads: **'Prohibit industrial construction along the Dnieper left bank in the vicinity of the town of Kanev'**. It looks like the Government has heeded public's voice. But following lines have been a cause of surprise - they deal with the construction, along the same left bank, of a giant manufacturing complex "for housing production departments of association 'Zagranenergostroy'" and a powerful industrial boiler house along the Dnieper left bank.

One is getting an impression that the Republic's Government adopted the third decision only to seal legislatively the ruining by Minenergo SSSR [USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification] of the protected landscape of the Shevchenko Memorial in the town of Kanev. The Republic's public was hoping that giving the Shevchenko State Memorial (established in 1925) the status of a national preserve would ensure its legal protection. But if we allow today to conduct industrial construction in this zone, the Tarasova Gora [Taras' Hill] and its unique surrounding landscape will forever lose their inimitability.

It is well known that this construction project is illegal. All creative unions and the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences have voiced their protests against it. Neither the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Culture, which has the jurisdiction over the memorial, nor the Republican Society for the Preservation of Historic and Cultural Monuments have or can give permission for the project. The Soviet Culture Foundation and the Ukrainian Culture Foundation have also unambiguously expressed their opinion as to the incompatibility of the Shevchenko

Memorial and industrial objects. The USSR Ministry of Culture has resolutely protested against industrial construction and modernization of industrial enterprises along the Dnieper left bank and added the Shevchenko Memorial in Kanev to the list of cultural memorials of All-Union importance. And lastly, a decision of the Secretariat of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee made it incumbent upon the Republic's Government to remove the industrial zone from protected areas. How then is one to interpret the fact that in our State there is a threat of destruction of the age-old national holy place, although the public opinion of the Republic, the Soviet Union and the entire world has unambiguously demanded its preservation?

Considering the Government decision on creating the Shevchenko National Memorial being incompatible with the other decision, which permits the construction of a Minenergo SSSR boiler house and industrial complex,

WE DEMAND:

1. Stop immediately all kinds of construction work by production association "Zagranenergostroy" in the protected landscape zone of the Shevchenko Memorial and dismantle the construction that has been started there,

and restore the natural historic environment that has been disturbed during silting and industrial construction.

2. Solve at last the issue of moving the industrial and supply base of production association "Zagranenergostroy" to the Dnieper right bank or to another place.

3. Include the protected landscape zone of the Kanev Shevchenko Museum-Memorial, with the area of 2,184 hectares, where construction is being conducted, into the territory of the T.G. Shevchenko Memorial, in order to protect it from any current or future encroachments.

4. We think the Republic's Government must state its position in regards to this situation openly and unambiguously - whether to create a national Shevchenko Memorial in Kanev or conduct industrial construction in the Memorial territory, because a national holy place and a boiler house, albeit the most modern one, and other industrial objects cannot coexist peacefully on this holy land. Their construction in full view of the Tarasova Gora, the action zone of Shevchenko's immortal "Will", constitutes disdain for the people, the nation and the world culture.

59

22161

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.